Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-104
Tuesday
31 May 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-104 *31 May 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Supreme Soviet Presidium Ratifies INF Treaty 1
TASS Reports INF Treaty Ratification 12
Called 'Reliable Security' 12
Staroselskiy on Ratification 13
U.S. Senate Approves INF Treaty Ratification 14
Senate Rejects Amendments 14
Reagan Informed of Vote 14
Reagan Statement Circulated 14
Pact-NATO 'Mandate' Talks Held in Vienna 15
Karpov Comments on Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones *[East Berlin ADN]* 15

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

U.S. Pressuring Allies on Military Spending *[Bogachev]* 16
Nonaligned Session Being Held in Havana 16
Shevardnadze Greets Meeting 16
'Appeal' Passed 16
Message to Moscow Summit 17
Reagan Visit, INF, Afghan Withdrawal Viewed *[Orekhov in PRAVDA 29 May]* 17

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Senate Approves Military Budget 20
U.S. Human Rights Violations Described 20
Mayorov on Panama Situation 20
Puerto Rican Prisoners Held 20
'Fabricated Diagnoses' Noted 21
U.S.-Soviet Trade Reflects 'Cold War Times' 21
Yakovlev Receives Soviet, U.S. Veterans 22
Participants Named 22
Message Sent to Gorbachev 22
Deputy Foreign Minister Receives U.S. Scientists 22
American Citizens Received in Yerevan 22
Academic, Worker on Cooperation With U.S. 23
Results of U.S. Poll of Muscovites Cited 23
Support for CPSU Policies 23
'Good Feelings' Toward U.S. 24
Ignatyev Analyzes Irangate Trial Preparations 24
'Calling Moscow' Radio Link Set Up With U.S. *[Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]* 24

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Government Statement on SRV Withdrawal 25
Commentary Views Pullout 26
Impact on PRC Ties *[Lyutyy in PRAVDA 27 May]* 27

Near East & South Asia

'Text' of Statement on Afghan-Pakistan Accords *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 27
Pakistan Viewed as 'Violating' Geneva Agreements 29

Biryukov on Pakistan President's News Conference 29
Reserve Servicemen Appeal to Pakistani President 30
POW's Held in Pakistan Subjected to Torture 31
Najibullah Addresses Afghan National Assembly 31
Further on Address 32
Shevardnadze Meets With Afghanistan's Wakil 32
Wakil Departs Moscow 33
Afghanistan Protests Pakistani Arms Deliveries 33
Ryzhkov Greets New Afghan Prime Minister *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 33
BAKHTAR Comments on USSR-U.S. Summit 34
'Satisfaction' Toward Libya's Chad Initiative 34
Shevardnadze To Present 7-Point Mideast Plan *[Manama WAKH]* 34
'Specialist' on Summit, Middle East Issues *[Kuwait KUNA]* 35

West Europe

FRG Social Democratic Party Welcomes Summit 35
FRG Plane Reportedly Violated Soviet Airspace *[AFP]* 35
FRG's Genscher Cited on Chemical Weapons 36
Arbatov Accuses Thatcher of 'Ignorance, Egotism' *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* 36
Thatcher Cited on Improved East-West Ties *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 May]* 36
Danish-Norwegian TU Delegation Ends Visit *[TRUD 29 May]* 37
Labor Safety Discussed *[TRUD 26 May]* 37
Briefs 37
Soviet-French Consultations 37

Latin America & Caribbean

Panamanian Foreign Minister on U.S. Policy 37
Criticizes Media Coverage 37
Cuban Foreign Minister Malmierca on Summit 38
Sandinists Urge Further Talks With Contras 38
Talks Reportedly Postponed 39
Ortega: U.S. Hinders Contra Peace Efforts 39
Mexican Socialist Delegation Visits Moscow *[PRAVDA 24 May]* 39

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Yeltsin Calls for Ouster of Ligachev *[London BBC Television]* 40
Arbatov: Yeltsin 'Did Not Act Correctly' *[AFP]* 41
Further on Armenia, Azerbaijan Unrest 41
Meeting Urges Normalization *[Yerevan]* 41
Demonstrations in Yerevan *[AFP]* 42
New First Secretaries Meet 42
More Protests Noted *[AFP]* 42
Azerbaijan Plenum Fires Officials 42
Tatar Tent Village Surrounded by Troops *[AFP]* 43
Police Break Up Leningrad Demonstration *[AFP]* 43
Police Break Up Tbilisi Demonstration *[AFP]* 43
Dissidents Air Complaints to Western Media *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 24 May]* 43
Gorkiy Street Demonstration Described *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 44
Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session 45
25 May Proceedings Noted *[IZVESTIYA 26 May]* 45
Housing Program Discussed 26 May 46
Resolution on Supreme Court *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 46
Gromyko Addresses Award Ceremony *[PRAVDA 26 May]* 47
New Parliamentary Group Leader Elected 49
Italian Communist Daily on Plenum Results *[Milan L'UNITA 24 May]* 49
Kharchev 'Remarkably Frank' on Religion *[Paris LE MONDE 27 May]* 49

Nikolayev Blames Ministry for Siberian Air Crash *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 May]* 50
L'UNITA on Conference Delegates Dispute *[Milan 23 May]* 51
Delegate Elections Still Face 'Inertia' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 May]* 52
Tarasenko Views People's Power, Restructuring *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 21]* 54
'Original' Andreyeva Letter Analyzed *[Milan L'UNITA 23 May]* 55
Leningrad Barrage Imperils Ecology *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 13 May]* 58

Scientific

Two Artificial Earth Satellites Sent Into Space 59
'Cosmos-1949' Launched 28 May 59
'Cosmos-1950' 'Working Properly' 60
Sagdeyev on Soviet-U.S. Space Cooperation 60

Supreme Soviet Presidium Ratifies INF Treaty

LD2805142388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1100 GMT 28 May 88

[USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session on the ratification of the INF Treaty held in the Kremlin—live]

[Text] [Gromyko] I declare the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium open.

Comrades, there is just one issue on the agenda: Ratification of the treaty signed not so long ago by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the Soviet side, during his visit to Washington, and by President Reagan on the U.S. side.

I do not know whether you have any other point concerning our agenda. Since there are no other points, we approve the agenda which comprises just one question, but a question of exceptional importance. Everyone will agree with this. We are starting to consider the treaty submitted for ratification.

Comrade Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, will deliver a report on behalf of the USSR Government. Over to you, please.

[Shevardnadze] Esteemed comrades: The USSR Council of Ministers has instructed me to set forth to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium the point of view of the government on the ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The treaty was signed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, examined and approved by the USSR Council of Ministers, and discussed in the Foreign Affairs Commissions of both chambers of the Supreme Soviet.

The USSR Foreign Ministry and Defense Ministry presented the commissions with all the material relating to the treaty, which made it possible for the deputies to study on an expert level and exhaustively, all the treaty's provisions and obligations arising from it and to give their agreement based on the objective facts of the discussion of this.

During examination of the treaty, representatives of the relevant ministries and departments gave all necessary explanations about its various aspects. One can say that both in the USSR Supreme Soviet and in the U.S. Senate the treaty was subjected to a scrupulous, comprehensive analysis.

At the session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet of Nationalities, I have already had occasion to talk in detail about the significance of the treaty. Allow me to talk today about its importance from the point of view of the treaty's impending coming into force.

The Soviet Union sees in its conclusion confirmation of the validity and realistic nature of the foreign policy conception being implemented and the beginning of the realization of the program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the present century, put forward in Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January 1986. Alongside the Stockholm accords and the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, this treaty embodies the new political thinking in action. It opens up wide scope and, what is more, on a global scale for progress toward a nuclear-free, nonviolent, and more secure world.

The outlines of such a world are today delineated more clearly than before, for apart from all else, the treaty which is to be ratified also means the overcoming of a psychological barrier in relations between two nuclear powers. Leading objectively to an increase in trust between them, and to a strengthening of strategic stability, the conclusion and ratification of the treaty predetermines the attaining of a qualitatively different level in cooperation to resolve the most important tasks for the whole of mankind, the chief among which is, without dispute, preservation of peace and of modern civilization, and the survival of the human race.

An element of the treaty which is of no less importance for the future is the fact that it makes a start on a practical reduction of military expenditure, which has reached truly astronomical proportions throughout the world. Thus the treaty matches up to one of the most pressing behests of the times. At the same time, it clearly certifies recognition of the fact that armed forces should be organized on the principles of sufficiency for defensive purposes—in other words, at the lowest possible level of armament which ensures for the sides equal security. As a result of the discussion about the treaty, all questions concerning the way that the signing of the treaty will affect our security and the security of our friends and allies have been eliminated. Moreover, confidence that the treaty eliminates a strategic threat to the security of the country and of the European socialist states from the Pershings and ground-based cruise missiles sited in Europe has been reinforced.

In the work on the treaty, the guiding lights for us were the interests of our people, those of our friends, and of the whole of the world community. However, some officials in Washington may have tried to prove otherwise. Assertions that the treaty came into being as a result of strong-arm pressure on us are capable of causing, and do cause, only an ironic smile. They are less than serious, to say the least, particularly against the background of what is taking place in the world. Approval for the treaty in virtually all West European countries, including NATO ones, and from the whole world community, to say nothing of our allies, who practically became real co-authors of the agreement, is convincing evidence of the fact that the majority of mankind is in

favor of nuclear disarmament. This is also backed up by the results of the voting in the U.S. Senate, which ratified the treaty by an overwhelming majority.

As a result, a qualitatively new situation is objectively arising, in which it is becoming ever more difficult for those who adhere to the nuclear deterrance doctrine to propagate and assert it. The idea of a nuclear-free world is exerting an ever greater influence on governments, parliaments, and the broad public of the Western countries. In Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the whole world, it is hoped and believed that when the treaty comes into force, a tendency will take shape toward reducing military programs, cutting military spending, and allocating the resources saved for development needs.

Today it is possible to talk rather definitely about the benefits that our economy will gain from this treaty. The resources saved that are put into the budget of the national economy will be allocated to meeting social needs. The elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will enable the scientific and production potential of defense industries, which will be released, to be redirected to development and to production of civilian goods and services to meet the urgent needs of the Soviet people.

By converting industrial installations engaged in missile production alone, it is planned as soon as 1988—according to preliminary estimates—to gain for the national economy a real supplement of tens of millions of rubles. New types of drilling equipment, metal-cutting machine tools, and high technology machinery for processing agricultural produce, new consumer goods and other strictly peaceful items will be produced instead of missiles and their launchers.

The nature of the output of scientific and design organizations that were until recently engaged in production in the sphere of military industry will also change. The design bureau, therefore, which has developed RSD-10 missiles, will begin to work on an order of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology, working on a meteorological carrier rocket which may even be exported in the future.

In addition, R300 million, which was previously assigned for military spending, will be redirected to the social sphere. As a result of the elimination of combat missile complexes, great material and technical resources will be put at the disposal of the national economy, in particular, several hundred unique transport vehicles of huge freight lifting capacity. The knowledge and experience of a considerable number of highly qualified experts will find application in other areas. Preparing for implementation of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles—the fist major agreement in the sphere of real disarmament—is not a simple matter but a difficult one. It requires new knowledge and skills and, I would say, breaking through the limits of usual stereotypes. Working in coordination and showing a deep understanding of the historic task, the Defense Ministry and other interested ministries and departments, together with the USSR Foreign Ministry, have carried out preparations for the elimination of the missiles and provided for the reception and accommodation of U.S. inspection groups. Corresponding work has also been done by the U.S. side. Our experts on the spot have acquainted themselves with the monitoring [kontrol] sites. A group of Soviet inspectors has been set up and trained. Several rounds of technical consultations have been held with the U.S. specialists on organizing and carrying out inspections. Needless to say, there have been problems. Questions on various technical aspects of monitoring [kontrol] arose both with the Americans and with us. The last of these questions was successfully resolved as a result of the recent Geneva talks with the U.S. secretary of state.

Mutual understanding has been achieved regarding the procedure by which particular provisions of the treaty concerning inspection are to be implemented. This should not be seen as something that puts the treaty in doubt. Certainly, the treaty is a carefully prepared document; yet it is obvious that in such a complex and, without exaggeration, trail-blazing enterprise, there may be a few elements requiring elaboration. We are, therefore, far from seeing malice on anyone's part in our partners' desire to dot all the i's. After all, we too want to exclude even the slightest possibility of any ambiguities in interpreting the agreement.

As I have already said above, questions—and they have not been simple ones—have arisen with us as well. And I should say that the questions raised by our side have been more serious. I must say plainly that if they have not been resolved, ratification of the treaty by our country's Supreme Soviet would not have been possible. We understand that the U.S. Senate would not have consented to ratification, either, if certain elements had not been elucidated. But solutions were found. In Geneva, and also in Vienna, agreements and understandings were achieved which have the same force as the provisions of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The USSR will act on this assumption if the United States adheres to the same position. We hope for the appropriate reaction on the U.S. side.

Discussion with the Americans of the procedure for carrying out the provisions on inspection has confirmed the viability of the treaty. In order to resolve possible problems and dispute situations associated with implementation of the treaty, a special control [kontrolnyy] commission is to be set up. The national centers of the Soviet Union and the United States for reducing the nuclear danger are also charged with solving certain tasks of the implementation of the treaty.

The treaty establishes stringent and reliable monitoring [kontrol]. On-the-spot inspection, for example, includes six different forms of verfication [proverka]. In addition

to the territory of the USSR and the United States, inspection also covers the bases of the territory of other states where missiles are sited: the Soviet ones in the GDR and the CSSR, and the U.S. ones in Britain, the FRG, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Coordination of the inspection procedures with the NATO countries—Britain, the FRG, Italy, and the Netherlands—has been completed. As for Belgium, because of the recent government crisis, the agreement with the United States on inspections on Belgian territory has not yet been ratified there. Belgian representatives declare, however, that all necessary monitoring [kontrol] procedures can be carried out on their country's territory irrespective of the course of ratification.

Notes have been received from the GDR and CSSR in which they notified the endorsement of a tripartite agreement on the procedure for carrying out inspections at the Soviet missile facilities situated on their territories. Thanks to this, each side will have complete confidence that the agreement is being observed. It is now possible to claim quite definitely that both the Soviet Union and the United States and all of mankind will gain from this.

During the discussion of the treaty in the country, differing evaluations of this important document were encountered. Some representatives of the public expressed anxiety: Are we not making concessions to the West; are we not foregoing to some degree the interests of the country's defense; are there not elements of unilateral disarmament in the treaty? In the course of the discussion of the treaty, the public received precise and clear answers to these questions, which removed both its anxiety and doubts. Nevertheless, on the instruction of the government I have to state: The Soviet leadership has been striving and will continue to strive only for agreements that strengthen the country's security. This is a paramount task for us; in solving it, options which are damaging from the defense viewpoint or which undermine strategic stability are practically impossible. Having thoroughly weighed all military-strategic, political, scientific-technical, and economic factors and, on the basis of this, having concluded that the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles will not only not weaken our defenses, but, on the contrary, will strengthen strategic stability, the country's leadership decided to conclude the treaty.

The discussions which took place in our society and within these walls have turned out to be highly fruitful. The lasting significance of the Soviet program for a nuclear world has become mroe apparent, the flexibility and the adherance to the principle of enterprising Soviet foreign policy, based on new thinking, have been revealed more clearly. We once again thought out our approach to the talks in a most thorough way, getting down to fine detail, as they say, and analyzed the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, including also from the viewpoint of preparing the treaty on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons. Incidentally, a very good understanding has been set up here for the future, promising us a continuation of serious and businesslike contacts with the present and future U.S. Administrations and cooperation deriving from positions of reason and not from positions of strength.

The Soviet Government is firmly convinced that the treaty signed at the highest level in Washington is a good treaty corresponding to the military-political and national-economic interests of the Soviet Union. Being the most significant result of the restructuring which is occurring in international affairs, it strengthens international security. The treaty contains methods for solving the most complex disarmament problems, and these are now being used to work out a Soviet-U.S. agreement on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons while adhering to the ABM Treaty. Obviously, many of the provisions in the treaty on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, in particular those concerning monitoring [kontrol] will be applicable in the future to a broad spectrum of disarmament agreements. Ratification of the treaty will provide a good stimulus for a productive Moscow meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the party's Central Committee, and U.S. President Reagan. Esteemed comrades: On behalf of the USSR Government, I ask the Supreme Soviet Presidium to ratify the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

[Gromyko] Is that it?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, I have finished.

[Gromyko] Stay there for a moment. Comrade Presidium Members, do any of you have a question or questions to put to the rapporteur? If so, please go ahead. No? Good. [Shevardnadze leaves podium] A supplementary report from the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be delivered by Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union. Go ahead please.

[Ligachev] Esteemed comrades, on the instructions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities carefully examined the USSR-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed by Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan on 8 December, 1987.

I want to inform you that a working Preparatory Commission made up of 10 deputies was formed to study in detail all matters connected with the treaty. I would like to note the following circumstance, in particular: The discussion of the treaty at the joint session of the

commissions of both chambers and in the Preparatory Commission was conducted, to be frank, in an atmosphere of debate, in a businesslike manner, in specific terms, and very thoroughly. The opinions of the interested ministries and departments of the USSR, of authoritative experts, and of scientists, were heard. Incidentally, representatives of the parliaments of the GDR and Czechoslovakia, as countries directly affected by the treaty, took part in one of the sessions. Representatives of various circles of both the Soviet and foreign public also set forth their points of view. The work, to be frank, was conducted in a spirit of glasnost and openness [otkrytost] as a rule in the presence of a considerable number of journalists, including foreign ones. The sessions were carried on television, radio, and in the press, which also gave our public the opportunity to follow the progress of discussion of the treaty. The careful analysis of the treaty and thorough discussion of it conducted by the commissions have made it possible to come to the conclusions that can be summed up in brief in the following manner, comrades.

First, how the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles meets the security interests of the USSR and, in a broader context, the requirements of equal security for the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact countries, on the one hand, and of the United States and its allies, on the other. This matter was the subject of particular attention from the members of the commissions, particularly, as has been stressed here by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, as we knew from letters from Soviet citizens that a proportion of our people, our Soviet people, were rather worried about whether implementing the treaty would be fully in the security interests of the country, bearing in mind that the Soviet Union would have to destroy a larger number of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles than the United States. In addition, the missiles of Britain and France are not to be reduced.

After the all-around and, to be frank, in-depth examination of this matter in question, the commissions made the following conclusion: The principle of equality and equal security of the parties to the treaty has been observed. The defense capability of the Soviet Union and of its allies remains reliably guaranteed. Thus the treaty substantially improves the foreign policy conditions for implementing the restructuring policy in our country. Alongside this, the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers draw attention to the fact that in the event of implementation of the plans being discussed in NATO at the moment to compensate for the U.S. missiles being scrapped in Europe through the modernization and building up other nuclear weapons, this would undoubtedly undermine the process of practical disarmament that has begun.

Second, the ability to monitor [kontroliruyemost] observance of provisions of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles: Having studied the issue in question, the commissions have noted that the treaty determines a system of monitoring [kontrol], including on-site inspections [proverka], which will ensure a high degree of confidence in the fact that the provisions of the treaty will be strictly observed. As far as our country is concerned, the relevant Soviet ministries and departments have already conducted and are continuing to carry out the necessary work to guarantee the timely fulfillment of the treaty by the Soviet Union after it has come into force.

Third, the socioeconomic and other aspects of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles: On the basis of the material presented to them, the commissions satisfied themselves that our people and our country will indeed make a definite gain from switching to peaceful needs the labor material and financial resources released as a result of implementation of the treaty.

The commissions also examined the issue of preventing any undesirable ecological consequences of the process of destroying the missiles. As a result of the measures already adopted and being adopted on our part, the necessary conditions are being ensured such that any possibility, even the slightest, of harmful influence on the health of the population or the inflicting of damage on the environment is eliminated during the destruction of the missiles in the USSR.

Comrades, I would like to stress the following: In assessing the Soviet-U.S. treaty, the deputies and members of the commission have constantly checked their conclusions against the opinion of our people. I would say that they have studied all incoming information about the attitude of Soviet citizens from the various strata of Soviet society to the treaty in the most attentive and thorough way. From the broad discussion that developed in the country, we have been able to draw the conclusion that the overwhelming majority of Soviet people supports the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Letters and messages about the treaty express complete confidence and approval for the CPSU's peace-loving course.

It is well known that popular wisdom has it: The man who is building a house can do without a conflagration. Those who are engaged in improving the life of the people do not want war. This truth is fully applicable to our country, where both the person himself and his peaceful labor are the highest social values. At the same time, it should be noted that a number of influential figures in the NATO countries are following a course of nuclear deterrence. We know that in the United States, under the banner of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, they are trying to draw the world into a fresh stage of the arms race, the burden of which is borne, first and foremost, by the popular masses. There are those who would like the signing and ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles to be followed by a prolonged pause. The real process of disarmament should not halt. Such is the adamant demand of the whole of our Soviet people.

The conclusion of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles could signify the beginning of a rearrangement of Soviet-U.S. relations on the basis of active international cooperation. But there are forces in the United States and in Western Europe which oppose any steps to curtail the arms race and to develop further Soviet-U.S. relations. I think that it is not without some influence from these forces that the process of ratification of the treaty in the United States was, as is known, made complicated by various maneuvers and delays.

Comrades, overcoming immense difficulties, mankind is heading down the road of real disarmament and the strengthening of peace in the world. Just 3 years have passed since March 1985, since the April plenum of the Central Committee, when the party defined the course of acceleration of the development of society and of energetic political action in the international arena. As is noted in the theses of the party Central Committee for the 19th all-union party conference, the direct threat of world war has been reduced, and the international position of the Soviet Union has improved noticeably. I think we have every grounds for saying that the conclusion of the treaty on intermediate-and shorter-range missiles, and the Soviet Union's role in achieving it, have enhanced even more the prestige of our motherland, of our country, and of its foreign policy, throughout the world.

Summing up the whole of the work at the joint session on 23 May, the Foreign Affairs Commissions of both the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet came to the unanimous conclusion that the treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States on eliminating their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles should be approved, and that the Supreme Soviet Presidium be recommended to ratify it.

Comrades, the years will pass, and other times will come, but I think we have every grounds to say that grateful descendents will number this act among the significant events in the long and difficult struggle waged by mankind for a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

May I thank you for your attention.

[Gromyko] Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and minister of defense of the USSR, is called upon to speak.

[Yazov] Esteemed comrades: The Soviet-U.S. treaty for the liquidation of missiles of intermediate- and shorter-range is the first real step on the road toward nuclear disarmament. Its signing was a historic landmark in international development and in the implementation of our party's foreign policy strategy, elaborated by the 27th CPSU Congress. The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is the result of the new political thinking, its implementation in practice; it is the display by the Soviet Union of a responsible and constructive approach to solving the most acute questions of the present day. It provides for the destruction of two classes of Soviet and U.S. missiles. From now on, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States will produce any more ballistic or cruise missiles based on land with ranges from 500 to 5,500 km. Missiles of this class will thus be totally liquidated.

In assessing the treaty, it is necessary to stress that inasmuch as it provides for a bilateral reduction, its implementation will not lead to a reduction in the combat capability of the Soviet Armed Forces or in the security of our state. As is known, in accordance with the treaty, we shall have to liquidate approximately twice as many missiles as the United States. However, in a matter like this, a purely quantitative approach is not appropriate. It is not only quantity which determines the military significance of this treaty. In evaluating it, it is also necessary to take into account the political, economic, social, and moral-psychological aspects. From a purely military point of view, it should be borne in mind that the United States is liquidating its intermediate-range missiles in Europe, which in relation to the Soviet Union and to the countries of the socialist community, are, in effect, strategic ones. They are capable of destroying targets on our territory with a flight approach time of 8-10 minutes. The destruction of these missiles reduces the real threat to the European part of the USSR and to its allies and undermines the false hopes existing in the West of the possibility of achieving victory in a so-called limited nuclear war.

There is no doubt that if we had not signed the treaty, the Americans would have continued to deploy [razvertyvat] their Pershing-2's and cruise missiles which they started in 1983. This would have increased the threat of war and political tension in Europe, and the arms race. In the interests of safeguarding our security, we would also have had to take additional responsive measures, and thus the wheel of the arms race would have kept on continuously revolving. The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles cannot be looked upon as a win or a loss for anyone. Both sides made compromises—in particular, the United States agreed to the liquidation of nuclear warheads of the Pershing-1A's which belonged to the FRG; they gave up the idea of converting land-based cruise missiles into sea-based ones; they agreed to the method proposed by us for determining the flight range of ballistic and cruise missiles—in brief, each side made concessions to the other so as to balance their mutual interests in an acceptable manner.

I can state firmly that with the treaty's entry into force, the defense capacity of our country and the entire socialist community will be at a level which reliably guarantees our security. The treaty presented for ratification to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has been profoundly and comprehensively scrutinized, and all its provisions and positions have been checked in the most thorough manner. Of course, the treaty's entry into force, and the reduction of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles connected with this, will confront us with the

need to adopt measures to determine more precisely the structure of the strategic rocket forces, although we have no intention of compensating for the eliminated missiles or of competing with the West in the creation of specific types of weapons to replace these missiles. We are planning measures to provide for the officers and ensigns who will be released due to the disbanding of formations and units in connection with the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and we are devoting the necessary attention to maintaining the troops' combat readiness and perfecting management of them while the missiles are being eliminated.

The time that has elapsed since the treaty was signed has shown that for its provision to be implemented, the Defense Ministry and a whole number of other departments will have to invest some intensive and thoroughly planned preparatory work. The task ahead consists in removing from combat service, delivering to their place of elimination and eliminating—in the time periods specified by the treaty—intermediate- and shorter-range combat missiles: intermediate-range 10 [RSD-10, known as the SS-20] missiles; operational-tactical 22 [OTR-22, known as the SS-12] missiles; and operational-tactical 23 [OTR-23, known as the SS-23] missiles—launchers, support equipment, and installations. A package of measures connected with ensuring reliable monitoring [kontrol] of the sides' fulfillment of the obligations assumed has to be implemented. This means, first and foremost, the holding of inspections to check initial data on existing arms, to observe the elimination process, and to verify that the arms indicated in the treaty are not being produced. We have prepared places for the destruction of the missiles; eight such places have been selected. Together with industry we have worked out technologies for eliminating the missile equipment and tested them in real conditions; administrative bodies have been set up and a communications system organized. In order to implement monitoring [kontrol] and carry out inspection activities, the training of inspectors from among highly-qualified servicemen and staff from other departments has been organized; of the 400 people specified in the protocol, more than 200 have been trained at special courses. Work is being done jointly with industry to create technical monitoring [kontrol] means, and practical issues connected with activities of U.S. inspection groups on our territory are being tackled. Jointly with the Foreign Ministry, the Finance Ministry, and Gosplan of the USSR, the preparation of a special decision of the USSR Council of Ministers on procedures for material, financial, and domestic back-up for inspection activities is nearing completion. All the preparatory work to eliminate the arms affected by the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and for inspection activities is under the constant supervision of the Defense Ministry. In line with the decision adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and by the Soviet Government, and in agreement with the GDR and CSSR leadership, our operational-tactical 22 missile brigades have been withdrawn from the territory of these countries, and the missiles and launchers have been concentrated in their places of elimination.

The Soviet Armed Forces wholly and totally approve and support the policy of the party and government aimed at reducing tension, at a political settlement for regional conflicts, including the Afghan issue, and at strengthening confidence-building measures and creating a comprehensive system of international security. The bringing into force of the treaty between the USSR and United States on eliminating their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is in line with the interests of the whole of the Soviet People. I propose that the treaty be ratified.

[Gromyko] The floor is given to Vladimir Vasiyevich Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

[Shcherbitskiy] Esteemed comrades: The Supreme Soviet Presidium is discussing an issue which, I would say, is of unfading and exceptional importance. The matter concerns the ratification of the first treaty in history to eliminate two classes of death-dealing nuclear weaponry, intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. It is clear, and has already been said, that this treaty opens up the way to arms reduction, and from there to a world without nuclear weapons, and also to an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations and an improvement in the international political climate as a whole.

We know—we have undoubtedly all observed this—just how difficult and prolonged the road to this treaty was. The elaboration and signing of this document were the result of the dynamic ,peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union leadership, efforts which, as we know, were supported at every stage by the fraternal socialist countries. Of course, intensive, long diplomatic talks were required.

Why is all this happening? It is happening, I think, because mankind has realized the perniciousness of nuclear weapons as a whole, not just for itself but for the whole of nuclear civilization. The conclusion about the impermissibility of a nuclear conflict, which can have no victors, was, as we know, registered by the top leaders of the Soviet Union and of the United States even at their first meeting in Geneva in November 1985. The practical implementation of the treaty that has now been worked out should, of course serve as a kind of watershed between the growth of a nuclear threat and the demilitarization of our globe, and also be an important step in the direction of rearranging international relations from confrontation to active peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial international cooperation. Through the example of this treaty, we are once again convinced that the new political thinking is bearing its

first, weighty fruits. I consider that the treaty which we are discussing today is fully in accordance with the fundamental conclusion of the 27th CPSU Congress, that in today's conditions it is vitally necessary to take the mutual interests of states and peoples into account to the maximum, and that genuine security can only be mutual and universal.

Esteemed comrades, the people of the Ukraine, like all Soviet people and like all people of goodwill in the world, approve and support with enthusiasm and hope the historic aims and content of the treaty which is being discussed today. In it we see a good start along the road toward subsequent substantial reductions in strategic nuclear offensive weapons. A priority task on which our diplomats and military men are now working is a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons, of course in conditions where there is strict observance of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972.

I think that under these conditions this treaty also creates the prerequisites for achieving progress on weapons reduction in other areas. As is well known, the question of eliminating chemical weapons and reducing conventioanl weapons—and soon—is being actively discussed.

I think that what we imply here is that it is of fundamental importance to safeguard guaranteed confidence that the treaty which we are obviously ratifying on intermediate- and short-[maloy] range missiles will be fulfilled in full accordance with the way in which it was signed on 8 December in Washington. That is very important.

Thus, having studied the text of this treaty and the voluminous documents relating to this treaty, taking into consideration the arguments set forward by our experts and specialists, and taking into consideration the arguments which have been set forward on behalf of the government by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze today, as well as taking into consideration the opinions of the Foreign Affairs Commissions on which Comrade Ligachev has reported, I too have become convinced that the treaty on intermediate- and short-[malaya] range missiles, or rather on the elimination of these missiles—a treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States—is in accordance with the interests of our states, and it should be ratified.

[Gromyko] Over to Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

[Zaykov] Esteemed comrades: In setting about the ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-[menshey] range missiles, we can say with confidence that in the process of detailed study and discussion of this document by the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, all aspects of this complex problem were taken into consideration, and all questions and doubts were removed.

It has been convincingly confirmed that it does no damage to the legitimate interests of any party and gives no unilateral advantage or benefit to anyone. Its foundation is equality and equal security. The balance of security is preserved but now at a lower level. Such is the conclusion reached by the deputies of the Supreme Soviet, who have openly made an expert examination of the treaty, involving specialists and the broad public. Meetings and conversations with Muscovites in labor collectives and in the streets of the city, their letters to party and soviet bodies, particularly at this time, on the eve of the summit meeting, confirm that Soviet people perceive the fact of the signing of the treaty as a long-awaited breakthrough toward a nuclear-free world. Our people see in the treaty a weighty and specific result of restructuring and a victory for the new political thinking.

It is important that this is the first breakthrough in real disarmament. A new military-political situation will be forming in Europe, one fostering the consolidation of the process of disarmament that has been begun. The scale and the innovativeness of the treaty lie in the fact that the world's two mightiest powers have adopted a pledge not just to restrict their weapons but to destroy, at the same time, two classes of most dangerous nuclear missiles, with measures of the strictest verification being observed. We have embarked on an asymmetrical elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, realizing that simple arithmetic is not the main thing here. There is no weaponry which the Soviet Union would not be prepared to restrict or ban on a mutual basis. That was stated at the 27th party congress. This line remains unshakeable; it is further developed in the theses of the CPSU Central Committee worked out for the 19th all-union party conference. A breakthrough was necessary, the attainment of specific deeds following many years of fruitless debate. The dynamism of our foreign policy after April 1985 and the statement of 15 January 1986 are typified by the milestones of Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington.

The first treaty on real disarmament has been signed. The foreign policy aspects of the Afghan problem have been resolved. The atmosphere in the world is becoming substantially healthier, and the negative evolution of international relations, primarily Soviet-U.S. relations, has been halted. Real conditions have been created so that the change for the better that has occurred may have a steady nature imparted to it, and for its further progress to be ensured and, as far as possible, speeded up. Althogh the treaty has been concluded between two countries, the USSR and the United States, we quite justifiably consider it the collective creation of international reason. The treaty provides a key for resolution of military-technical problems in holding talks on other kinds of weapons, particularly strategic ones.

The treaty provides the key to the solution of military-technical problems in conducting negotiations on other forms of armaments, particularly on strategic ones. Its implementation will undoubtedly stimulate negotiations on conventional weapons, too, in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. It has become clear to the peoples of the entire world that nuclear disarmament is not an illusion. It is fully possible and achievable. It will be brought about by successive steps in this direction, of which the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is the first. The treaty is the beginning of restructuring in international relations on the principles of the new political thinking and the present-day way of looking at the world.

The ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is fully in the interests of the Soviet people and confirms their sincere desire to expand and intensify international economic, scientific, and cultural relations, and to improve Soviet-U.S. relations as a whole. The active interstate dialogue in the process of preparing the treaty, and in particular the Washington meeting, were a kind of threshold of trust; having crossed this threshold, the USSR and United States entered a new phase in relations between them. The forthcoming meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan opens up new horizons for this and inspires hopes for achievement of accords on key problems which are still more epoch-making for the fate of peace in their significance, on strategic offensive weapons and antimissile defense.

I propose that the treaty between the USSR and United States on the liquidation of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles be ratified.

[Gromyko] Yefrem Yevseyevich Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has the floor.

[Sokolov] Esteemed comrades: The memorial complex of Khatyn is known far beyond the borders of our republic and country. It is a penetratingly sad monument dedicated to those 186 Belorussian villages which were burned by German fascist occupiers together with their people and failed to survive.

There is a place in Khatyn where three birch-trees are growing, surrounded by black granite. An eternal flame is placed where a fourth one would be expected. This is a symbol, a symbol speaking of the fact that one in four residents of Soviet Belorussia was killed in the furnace of World War II. Occupiers destroyed over a half the republic's national wealth. Direct material damage alone amounted to 35 times more than the republican budget for 1940.

But the last war was, in technical terms, a war of engines, a war of conventional weapons. It caused incalculable suffering to many peoples of the world. As to the calamities that can be incurred by a nuclear war, they beggar human imagination. Till lately, its threat has been implacably building up. Today, however, thanks to the new political thinking, whose creation is being rightfully ascribed by the people to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the international situation is fundamentally changing.

Metaphorically speaking, the ice of the cold war is melting, and the flame of the hot war is being put out. The working people of Belorussia warmly approve the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and of the Soviet Government—the policy of society's revolutionary renewal and the consolidation of peace in the whole world. On behalf of the residents of our republic's cities and villages, I support the proposal on the ratification of the treaty under discussion.

We assess it in terms of a breakthrough in the wall of mistrust and a healthy bud of the new political thinking, whose initiator is the leadership of Lenin's party. This treaty is also a result of the joint efforts of the states of the socialist community, of the assistance of other countries, of public movements of peace supporters, and of the aspirations of all peoples. This treaty is also the result of the U.S. Administration's realization that it is necessary to step up a dialogue, and it is abandoning some dogmas and obsolete notions. The working people of the republic believe that implementation of the treaty will lay the beginning of a most noble goal—deliverance of mankind from a nuclear nightmare—being implemented, and that it will assist in creating an all-embracing system of international security.

Our people believe that it is immoral and blasphemous of some people in the West to say that nuclear weapons guarantee peace, and of some states to strive for military superiority and upgrading of their weapons as a form of compensation for any disarmament steps. Making up for the first breakthrough in the physical elimination of nuclear weapons by something else is nothing but an aspiration to reverse the disarmament process that has begun and to create new obstacles on mankind's road to survival.

Today, in the nuclear and missile age, prejudices, alienation, and confrontation must be replaced by the understanding that all countries and peoples have common destinies. Practical issues concerning the ratification of the treaty are also capable of opening up a way of trust, and from trust to partnership of all countries and peoples based on balance of their interests.

Soviet Belorussia, together with all the fraternal republics, is ready for that. On the eve of the 19th all-union party conference the party organizations in our republic are trying to ensure that restructuring becomes the vital cause of every Communist and the patriotic duty of all working people, so that their peaceful creative work on all sections of economic and cultural construction

becomes increasingly productive with every passing day. It is precisely in this creative effort that our people see the main thrust of restructuring, including the restructuring of international relations.

[Gromyko] I ask Stepan Alekseyevich Shalayev, member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the AUCCTU, to take the floor.

[Shalayev] Dear comrades, this is not the first time that a very important document submitted for ratification is being discussed in the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet in this hall. Perhaps, as never before, we have assembled at this session with a greater sense of the special responsibility we bear. Our words about supporting the treaty reflect the attitude of the Soviet people to this treaty more precisely and fully than ever before, as the first treaty that does in practice put an end to or should put an end to the arms race—and not only put an end to the arms race but turn it back as well.

The Soviet trade unions, expressing the will of its more than 141 million members, of practically all working people, welcome this treaty because its positive consequences may be felt not only in the military and political sphere but in the social and economic one as well. Conditions are actually being created, including for our country, for channelling into social needs considerable additional funds which are being expended on creating missiles. The fact that even now those factories affected are already beginning to switch their production capacities over to production of civilian goods, the output of civilian goods, cannot fail to gladden us. Thus, for example, at the Votkinsk machine-building works, production has started of a new generation of very good machine tools. The works has received a large order from the agro-industrial complex for producing cooling devices for milk pasteurizing machines.

The production of consumer goods is being increased. I can give you examples both for the Volgograd machine building works and for the Petropavlovsk machine-building works of the Ministry of Defense Industry, where the actual production of civilian goods is being started. The fact that the measures taken at those works are providing for full employment of working people when the changeover to civilian production occurs can only be a matter for satisfaction. Without any loss of earnings, the opportunity is given to such, one might say, highly qualified collectives, to direct their efforts into resolving highly important national economic tasks.

I would like to cite yet another example in this connection. A Soviet-West German enterprise recently set up has upheld a proposal from the Soviet side to create a new powerful self-propelled crane with a load capacity of up to 140 tonnes in order to pull the eliminated SS-20 missiles by tractor. The first model of this type has already been made. This is yet another example of how machinery that is no longer needed can be used very effectively after the missiles have been eliminated.

Our country is thereby setting an example of a very responsible attitude, I would say, to the treaties that have been concluded: an example of the new political thinking in practice, an example of how the defense industry can convert to peaceful aims in the interests of the people and in the interests of raising prosperity. I am obliged to say this for the further reason that, in the West at present, many politicians and many specialists belonging to the military-industrial complex are especially actively continuing to frighten their peoples with the prospect that disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, may require great expense and may increase unemployment—in other words, may become another heavy burden on the shoulders of the working people.

It's a strange logic: to force up the production of weapons of mass destruction and spend hundreds of billions of rubles for those purposes is no burden, yet to reduce production of those weapons is, in their opinion, a heavy new burden on the shoulders of the workers. It must be said that the working people of the whole world are well aware that only disarmament can make it possible to free enormous resources for solving very important, human, and humane tasks, such as unemployment, hunger, poverty, the ecological danger, disease, and, of course, questions of debt. That is why all three of the major international trade union centers—the WFTU, the ICFTU, and the WCL [World Confederation of Labor] and practically all the national trade union organizations unanimously support the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. And, considering this treaty—the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles—to be a highly important step toward a nuclear-free world, the Soviet trade unions unanimously urge ratification of the treaty that we are examining.

At the same time, we would like to appeal to the leadership of our country not to relax its efforts in these very difficult and complex negotiations with the U.S. Administration for the early achievement of accords on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms, on keeping nuclear weapons out of space, for early achievement of accords to eliminate chemical weapons, on stopping nuclear tests, and on a gradual reduction of other weapons of mass destruction. Those efforts by our leadership will have the still more vigorous support of our working people, trade unions, all the international working class, all progressive mankind and all who value peace on earth. I'd like, in conclusion, to wish the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit complete success on behalf of our peoples and on behalf of world peace.

[Gromyko] Nina Nikolayevna Ryzhkova, member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and welder at the Podolskiy machine-building works, has the floor.

[Ryzhkova] Dear comrades, today we have to take a final decision on the question of ratifying the USSR-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. As never before, I am aware of the sense

of a tremendous responsibility to my electorate, to the Soviet people who have entrusted us with such a right. During the discussion of the treaty, quite a few different opinions have been expressed. An enormous number of letters from our fellow-countrymen have been sent to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and to newspapers and magazines. Among them were letters from many workers and collective farmers, the ordinary toiling people of the towns and countryside.

In these appeals, heartfelt, sincere support was expressed for the principled policy of our party aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons, and the historic document being discussed today was cordially approved. The Soviet people took an interest in the economic and social aspects of the conclusion of the treaty.

It must be owned that concern was sometimes expressed as well, as to whether the Americans would deceive us in implementing the treaty, and as to whether the verification preventing that is reliable.

A comprehensive and thorough discussion on all that was dealt with in the letters and speeches on the problems. People who knew something about it—diplomats, scientists, military people—made appraisals of the treaty. A great deal of work was done by the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the chambers and the subcommission formed by them. I think that after such an objective examination of all its proposals, a definite conclusion can be drawn. The treaty is a just one and serves the cause of peace and security. The problem of war and peace, of the very existence of mankind, does not leave a single home, a single family untouched. So it has to be resolved together, by the whole world. What I would particularly like to stress is that this is seen in the great political activity of the Soviet people that has succeeded in making its way through everywhere. During the discussion of the treaty, there were no outsiders or indifferent people. Every Soviet person regards this as his or her dearest and vital cause and is wholeheartedly with it.

Among the letters referring to the INF Treaty, there are quite a few written by women, and this is not surprising. A woman is a mother, providing the beginning for everything living, symbolizing goodness and humanism. She could not fail to have her weighty say in support of the bold, specific step along the path to a nuclear-free world.

The Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty is not only a military and political document but one that is profoundly common to all mankind, corresponding to the vital interests of the people. Being truly aware of this, we vote for it with a clear conscience. Ahead, on the path to a nuclear-free world without violence, naturally a great many more difficulties and problems will have to be overcome. But as folk wisdom has it, you get nowhere by standing still. In speaking out today in favor of the treaty's ratification, I firmly believe that it will open up such a road, a road to a world in which the happy laughter of a child and a mother's smile will never be clouded by the terrible face of war. Thank you.

[Gromyko] The floor is given to Academician Nikolay Gennadiyevich Basov, member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the board of the All-Union Society for Knowledge.

[Basov] Esteemed comrades! The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is the result of a great deal of preparatory work by representatives of our country and of the United States at the most varied levels, from scientific and technological, political and military experts, to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President. While drafting this treaty, our government was in constant consultation with our friends and allies and also with other countries, and took their opinions into account. Peoples of all continents are impatiently awaiting the ratification of the treaty. Intermediate- and shorter-range missiles are among the types of weapons which are closest to the threshold of nuclear war and to the so-called limited or local version of it. Even if one allows the thought that use of these weapons would not lead to a world conflict, it would inevitably cause immense human and material losses in areas where they were used. This problem is particularly acute in Europe, with its high concentration of population, industrial installations, and nuclear power stations. The destruction of these by intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is virtually unavoidable because of their short flight time and would cause an ecological catastrophe of a global scale, the consequences of which are difficult to imagine.

I call for the ratification of the treaty, which closes off an extremely dangerous channel for use of nuclear weapons, to be supported. Here it is important to bear in mind that, although this treaty does not decrease the total numbers of nuclear warheads very much, it is the fruit of the new thinking, and creates a new political, social, and psychological atmosphere, and it could become a good model for further work in reducing strategic and other weapons. Ratification of the treaty resolves for the first time one of mankind's most difficult tasks by outlawing a specific kind of weaponry.

Unfortunately, the development of science has always been accompanied by the military application of its achievements, an increase in the volume of industrial orders, and an increase in the numbers of researchers working for war. Thus the development and improvement of weapons creates a heavy burden for society, both because of the militarization of the economy and because of the diversion of intellectual resources from peaceful and often global problems. This tendency drastically increased with the emergence of nuclear missiles

and is brought to an extreme and absurd level in the Strategic Defense Initiative. The cost of developing and building the SDI systems comes to fantastic sums, thousands of billions of dollars.

Meanwhile, its feasibility is far from proved. This conclusion stems from elementary assessments, and it is also confirmed by a report from the American Physics Society, published on behalf of leading U.S. scientists. For example, the report shows that the current state of laser technology—the power, economic, and other characteristics of existing lasers—does not allow for creation of laser weapons with destructive action, that this task requires building a new generation of lasers which would need time going beyond the remaining years of the 20th century. At the same time, the expenditure necessary to build SDI could provide the solution to such a major problem as the energy problem, for example, for such countries as the USSR and United States, by building fusion power engineering. We are prepared to start implementing an international program, and it is already beginning to be implemented.

In light of the new thinking, I think it is appropriate to try to pose another question, to try to come to agreement on banning strike laser and beam weapons, thus saving immense material funds and intellectual potential for the resolution of peaceful problems of all mankind. I am confident that the scientists of the United States and of many other countries will support this proposal.

Coming back to the treaty, I would like to say that it represents a major contribution to the cause of peace and disarmament, and to the cause of the strengthening of the national security of our country, and I call for it to be ratified.

[Gromyko] The floor is given to Valentina Vladimirovna Tereshkova, member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries.

[Tereshkova] Esteemed comrades! The fact that the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet is today discussing the ratification of the treaty on total elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles is in no small way thanks to the contribution of the public of the Soviet Union and of the United States and other countries. The antiwar movements both in the West and in the East have drawn public attention to this problem through their energetic action against the nuclear threat and have urged governments to resolving it urgently and radically. The overwhelming majority of the international public recognizes the historic importance of the treaty and advocates its ratification and subsequent steps in this direction, first and foremost, a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons with adherence to the ABM Treaty.

This is shown by numerous meetings which the Union of Soviet Friendship Associations and other Soviet public organizations have held recently with the public of foreign countries. But, at the same time, it must be said plainly that there exists among the foreign public a failure of understanding, an inability sometimes to overcome the stereotypes of mistrust toward our country, formed in the period of confrontation.

Particular public anxiety is caused by the intention of some representatives of the NATO countries to compensate for the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles by building up other weapons, including nuclear ones. As a result of the signing of the threaty, realism is gradually beginning to gain the upper hand over fear and mistrust and is eroding the hostile image which is one of the main obstacles to contact and dialogue. This applies, first and foremost, to Soviet-U.S. ties. For the Soviet Union remains to this day a country about which the Americans know little. On the other hand, we too must actively foster an objective familiarization with the life, history, and culture of the American people.

Together with the U.S. public we are now seeking new, non-traditional forms of cooperation. Dozens of projects which could not have been dreamed of earlier are being implemented. Direct ties between the public of U.S. states and of union republics have been established with the aid of the Union of Soviet Friendship societies, and of the influential U.S. organization Friendship Force. Forums of the broad public of the United States and the USSR, with prominent state figures of the two countries taking part, have started to be held as a traditional measure by the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies and the USSR-USA Society, and the American Chautauqua Institute with USIA.

The number of proposals for twinning Soviet and U.S. cities has increased; already, more than 40 cities are exchanging municipal management specialists, artistic collectives, and professional and youth groups. Given the existence of a mutual desire, areas of cooperation can be found not only on the ground but in space as well. Impressive prospects are opened up, for example, by the possibility of the joint study of the planet Mars. Such a major initiative would be truly worthy of two great peoples and would serve the interests of the whole of mankind. The many threads of Soviet-U.S. ties are beginning to create a tangible fabric of trust and mutual understanding, without which further progress along the path of disarmament is impossible. I support the proposal for ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Thank you for your attention.

[Gromyko] Dear comrades, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet concludes discussion of the ratification of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The addresses today have shown—and I think that all of those present will agree with this—that study of this question was carried

out in detail and thoroughly both in the Foreign Affairs Commissions of both houses and during the preliminary stage by the Preparatory Commission.

Supreme Soviet deputies have examined the treaty from the standpoint of its conformity with the fundamental principles of the foreign policy of the CPSU, the defense interests of the Soviet Union and its allies, and the cause of consolidating world peace.

So the conclusion that ratification of the treaty, its entry into force, and consistent implementation by both sides fully correspond with these purposes resounded unanimously today as it did in the conclusion of the Foreign Affairs Commissions.

All of us recall that the signing of the treaty during the visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to Washington in December 1987 was perceived worldwide as a truly historic event. It was with justification that the comrades spoke of that today. For the first time, two nuclear powers agreed on the elimination of part of the arsenals which had been accumulating for decades. The Soviet-U.S. treaty is a victory for reason. It is also the result of carefully weighed assessment by the participants in the talks of their own interests and of the interests of the other side. It is a joint document which helps bring nearer the embodiment in reality of mankind's age-old dream of living without war. It is, as it were, a pass into a world without weapons. But the road to such a world is still not an easy one.

Hitherto, mankind has taken the road of accumulating nuclear weapons. The treaty's conclusion signifies a step in the opposite direction. Hitherto, people have said with good reason that the nuclear danger is on the increase. The concluding of the treaty signifies that this danger is beginning to diminish. It is beginning to diminish.

The treaty's approval by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be an act of great significance also on the level of the fruitful continuation of Soviet-U.S. dialogue on the most important problems of the international situation and on issues of bilateral relations. Our meeting is taking place on the eve of the visit to Moscow by the U.S. President and the summit talks. The ratification of the treaty by the USSR Supreme Soviet will graphically demonstrate the support of the supreme legislative body on behalf of our entire people for the policy of constructive development of relations with the United States.

We are in favor of a businesslike discussion and the solution of urgent problems wherever this is possible. The significance for the entire international affairs situation of the reinforcement of Soviet-U.S. relations by precisely such an atmosphere is obvious to all. In analyzing the treaty, the deputies also devoted due attention to the verification mechanism specified in it—and today's speakers spoke perfectly correctly on this subject—the verification of the strict fulfillment of all its provisions, while at the same time, taking into consideration the concern expressed by the Soviet people.

This was also given attention both by the commissions and here in the Presidium. The necessary steps were taken jointly with the U.S. Administration to define more precisely the individual provisions, and questions which arose in the course of discussion of the treaty at various stages were resolved. The ratification process in the United States ended yesterday, and we welcome this decision by the U.S. side. Like all the comrades who have spoken, I propose that the USSR-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed on 8 December 1987 in Washington, be ratified.

Comrades, you have the draft of a corresponding decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I put this question to the vote. Those who are for the ratification of the treaty please raise your hand. Good, you may put your hands down. Who is against? Nobody. Who abstained? Again, nobody. The treaty has been adopted unanimously and ratified by the Presidium. [applause] Let us sign the ratification deed! That is the custom; it has to be done. [video shows signing of document]

From the bottom of my heart, I thank all members of the Presidium and the non-members present here. And please don't lose that pen! [laughter] Well, they took it away from me; that's why I mention it. [laughter]

TASS Reports INF Treaty Ratification

Called 'Reliable Security'

LD2805114688 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 28 May 88

["INF Treaty Will Enhance Stability"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—The signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on scrapping intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is assessed by the world public, and justly so, as an unprecedented historic breakthrough to a nuclear-free future.

The very fact of the bilateral reduction in nuclear arsenals confirms that all people of the globe have one future. It also demonstrates that the Soviet plan for a total elimination of nuclear weapons from earth even as early as in the current century is feasible. Herein lies the political importance of the INF Treaty.

Under the treaty, the Soviet side is to destroy 1,752 deployed and non-deployed missiles. The American side announced that it would destroy 859 missiles of the same classes. Some experts in the West set out to calculate

which of the sides acquired more advantages under the treaty—the United States or the USSR which, by the way, agreed to reduce a by far greater number of nuclear warheads as well.

Such calculations are the relapses of the old thinking. In evaluating the importance of the treaty, it is the considerations of strategic stability, to enhance which meets in an equal measure the security interests of the United States and the Soviet Union, rather than arithmetical correlations, that are moved to the forefront. [sentence as received]

The INF Treaty undercuts the foundations of the adventurist concept of a "limited nuclear war", which is equally dangerous to all countries without exception. The point is that the role of the fuse of such a war was assigned to the American Pershing-2's stationed in West German territory in immediate proximity to the borders of socialist countries. These American missiles, like the similar systems of the USSR, will be destroyed under the treaty.

No one has ever succeeded in creating an acceptable scenario for the use of nuclear weapons. However, the prospect of waging a nuclear war in Europe, at a considerable distance from the U.S. shores protected, besides, by an anti-missile defence shield, attracted many military leaders in the United States.

Specialists point out that it is as inconceivable to limit a nuclear war to some geographical boundaries and dose the destructive power of the (?nuclear) [words indistinct] as, for instance, to limit the damage caused by a burning match thrown into a powder keg. Given the entire phantom nature of the goals pursued by the advocates of the limited nuclear war, however, this concept is highly perilous to the whole of mankind.

The danger of one or another class of nuclear armaments is determined not only by its destructive power or the number of nuclear warheads. For instance, the American Pershing-2 medium-range missiles are justly considered as very destabilizing weapons systems. Their flight time to targets in Soviet territory is eight to twelve minutes. This means that the other side—the Soviet Union—will have to ascertain an attack signal virtually in two to three minutes after it is picked up and make a decision on retaliatory measures against the aggressor. In such conditions, the risk of a war is enhanced steeply as a result of malfunctions in technical means of communication. In other words, the likelihood of an accidental, unpremeditated outbreak of a nuclear war is increased.

In the age of ours reliable security of states and peoples can be ensured only by political means, by mutually acceptable arms control agreements. The INF Treaty is exactly such an agreement.

Staroselskiy on Ratification

LD2905171888 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—By TASS commentator Sergey Staroselskiy:

By ratifying the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles ahead of the fourth Gorbachev-Reagan meeting that began today, the Soviet and American parliamentarians have rounded off what has been accomplished so far and recommended the leaders of the two countries to move on along the path started in Geneva three years ago.

The ratification of the treaty makes real for the first time in history the elimination of a whole class of nuclear arms and creates a qualitatively new atmosphere in which advocates of the "nuclear deterrence" doctrine find it increasingly hard to publicize it.

The INF Treaty strengthened the security of the United States and NATO on the one hand, and of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty on the other.

Its ratification objectively facilitates the strengthening of trust not only between Moscow and Washington, but also between the two major military-political blocs, and consolidates strategic stability.

It marks a qualitatively new level of cooperation in handling major common tasks, the most important being those of preserving civilisation and of the sruvival of mankind.

The treaty is important in that it lays the groundwork for the practical reduction of military spending estimated at astronomical sums.

In the USSR, for instance, 300 million roubles previously meant for defence needs, are now channelled into the social sphere.

New types of drilling equipment, metal-cutting lathes and high-technology machines for agriculture will be manufactured instead of missiles and missile launchers.

Moral and psychological aspects of the INF agreement are important, too. Anti-war public organisations, all people of goodwill were able to see that their efforts bear fruit, that their opinion is taken into account.

The experience gained by the sides in drafting the INF Treaty is undoubtedly useful at the current stage of work on an agreement that would cut by 50 percent the strategic offensive arsenals, being an example of political flexibility and common sense.

U.S. Senate Approves INF Treaty Ratification

LD2705194788 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Washington May 27 TASS—The U.S. Senate has just approved by an overwhelming majority vote (93 against 5) the resolution on the ratification of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate and Shorter-Range Missiles.

By this resolution the upper chamber of the U.S. Congress has given the President, in conformity with the U.S. Constitution, advice and consent to the scrapping of a whole class of nuclear weapons on condition of reliable control. The INF Treaty was signed at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Washington on December 8.

Senate Rejects Amendments

LD2705205888 Moscow TASS in English 2039 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Washington May 28 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko: The U.S. Senate has approved today by 93 votes against five the resolution on the ratification of the Soviet-American INF Treaty. The treaty signed on December 8, last year, during the Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow [as received] provides for the elimination under reliable control of Soviet and U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

The resolution on the ratification has been approved after a nine-day debate. In the course of the debate on the treaty a group of conservative-minded senators repeatedly made attempts to make all sorts of "amendments" to the text of treaty and the draft resolution on the ratification. All of them were, as a matter of fact, aimed at complicating or even frustrating the approval of the treaty.

Yet these attempts have been rejected by a majority vote. Thus on the last day of the debate on the treaty, the senators voted down (66 against 30) an amendment by Senator Malcolm Wallop (Republican, Wyoming), which contained the demand that the USA should abandon the treaty if "suspicions" arise that the USSR "violates" the provisions of the treaty.

After that the law-makers turned down by 86 votes against 10 an amendment of Senator Larry Pressler (Republican, South Dakota) who was trying to link the treaty with the so-called "human rights problem."

Reagan Informed of Vote

LD2805074388 Moscow TASS in English 0600 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Washington May 28 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

Representatives of the U.S. Senate's leadership have informed by the telephone almost at once President Reagan, who is in Helsinki now, of the outcome of the vote in the upper chamber of the U.S. Congress on the resolution of ratification of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The senators voted overwhelmingly 93-5 to approve the resolution.

Senate Democratic Majority Leader Robert Byrd told the President that the resolution in which the senators expressed their advice and consent to the ratification of the INF Treaty was "almost a unanimous vote". "We are very pleased to be able to give you this (ratification) in advance of your stepping on Soviet territory in Moscow", Republican Minority Leader in the Senate Robert Dole told the head of the administration. The President invited both leaders to attend the ceremony of the exchange of the instruments of ratification planned to take place in Moscow next week.

In a statement published by the White House President Reagan expressed his appreciation to the senators for "securing the timely approval of this treaty", which was made less than 48 hours before the beginning of the official visit of the head of the U.S. Administration to the USSR. Reagan emphasized that he is "very pleased" with the outcome of the vote in the Senate. The President added, however, that he continues "to have concerns about the constitutionality of some provisions of the resolution of ratification, particularly those dealing with interpretation".

This reservation by the President was caused by the amendment to the resolution worked out by both the Democratic majority and Republican minority leaders in the Senate. Democratic Majority Leader Robert Byrd stressed that it was meant to clarify and strengthen the Senate's role in interpreting this treaty, making its present interpretation mandatory for the current and any future President.

The amendment was elaborated to prevent the situation that formed with respect to the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty (ABM). The current administration is known to exert intensive efforts actually to torpedo this treaty by renouncing its initial, traditional reading and replacing it with "broader interpretation" so as to go ahead unimpeded with the implementation of the "Star Wars" programme.

U.S. Administration officials said that Howard Baker, White House chief of staff, who stayed in Washington to monitor the course of debates on the treaty in the Senate, flies to Moscow Sunday, where he will bring the instruments of ratification.

Reagan Statement Circulated

LD2805085688 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Washington May 28 TASS—The White House has circulated a statement of President Reagan which says, in part, that the President is "very pleased with the

actions of the United States Senate in consenting to ratification of the INF Treaty.... Today's action by the Senate clearly shows support for our arms reduction objectives".

The document approved by the Senate was handed in to Howard Baker, White House chief of staff, who would deliver it to President Reagan.

Pact-NATO 'Mandate' Talks Held in Vienna
LD3005091488 Moscow TASS in English 0901 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Vienna May 30 TASS—Another meeting within the framework of consultations of Warsaw Treaty and NATO representatives on drafting a mandate for future talks on cutting armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals was held here today.

Karpov Comments on Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones
LD2805081788 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0515 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Berlin, 28 May (ADN)—Viktor Karpov, departmental chief in the Soviet Foreign Ministry, has underlined the USSR's readiness to undertake guarantees for nuclear weapons-free zones in Europe. Karpov was interviewed in Saturday's BERLINER ZEITUNG.

"As is known, the USSR has stated that it will never use nuclear weapons against states which renounce their production and procurement, and do not store nuclear weapons on their territory," Karpov said. "We are ready to conclude special agreements on this with each one of those states. At the same time, the USSR is prepared to undertake the commitment not to use nuclear weapons against countries that become a party to nuclear weapons-free zones."

Viktor Karpov added: "The USSR has declared its readiness, in the event of the realization of the proposals of the GDR and CSSR on the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free corridor in Central Europe, to withdraw all Soviet nuclear weapons from the region and to guarantee and respect the nuclear-weapons-free status of that zone. The precondition is naturally an agreement that NATO also will not retain any nuclear weapons in the corridor proposed by the GDR and CSSR.

"The USSR has also stated its readiness to give all necessary guarantees in the event of the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Balkans.

"Similarly, the USSR is prepared to act as the guarantor of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in northern Europe and to consider important measures on its own territory which would contribute to the strengthening of its nuclear-weapons-free status. It is prepared to discuss the issues of a nuclear-weapons-free Baltic with interested parties."

The GDR's initiative in convening an international meeting for nuclear-weapons-free zones to be in Berlin at the end of June aroused great interest, Karpov added. "We see the importance of the conference in the fact that it enables the problem of the creation of nuclear-weapons-free zones to be seen from every aspect, and of a broad dialogue to begin on this between the representatives of various countries and political views. We hope that discussions on the entire complex of nuclear-weapons-free zones will help us to analyze fully the experiences made so far.

"In our view, the most important point is, however, that the comprehensive exchange of experiences in Berlin can enormously stimulate the movement for freeing large areas of Europe from nuclear weapons."

The Soviet disarmament expert described as untenable the argument frequently heard in the West that as a "continental power," the USSR would gain advantages from a zone of this type in Europe. "Under conditions of approximate overall parity, as has emerged in Europe between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, it is not just one side that benefits if there is no longer direct contact between nuclear armed forces and other offensive troops if they are distanced sufficiently. The benefit here is in every case bilateral as, thanks to such measures, the probability of a deployment of nuclear weapons is considerably reduced and material preconditions are created to give a defensive character to the opposing military groupings and enable further-reaching steps of arms limitation and disarmament to be undertaken." The USSR regards such zones as one of the most important measures for reducing the danger of nuclear war, for the geographic restriction of preparations for a nuclear war, for strengthening the regime of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and for creating a climate of trust and security on a regional level.

U.S. Pressuring Allies on Military Spending

LD2705174988 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Washington is widening the area of power pressure on its allies in an effort to make them increase military spending. Complaints of the U.S. delegation about an "insufficient contribution" of European allies to defences have become the dominant theme also at the two day session of the NATO Military Planning Committee underway in Brussels. At first defence ministers of European NATO countries made tentative attempts to uphold the interests of their countries. In answer to the claims of the U.S. delegation, representative of the Netherlands Wilhelm van Eekelen said that they in Washington do not appraise duly Europe's contribution to defences of the West. Ministers, members of the Eurogroup, have prepared in advance a booklet containing the data that the European countries ensure 90 percent of the numerical strength of NATO's forces and of artillery, 80 percent of tanks and military aircraft, a lion's share of other armaments of the alliance.

But just as it happened many times in the past, the European ministers have been unable to hold out against a strong pressure put up by the "big brother" from Washington. As the UPI reports, members of the NATO Eurogroup in the final count endorsed the U.S. proposal that the 72 F-16 U.S. aircraft be moved from Spain to Italy, that is closer to the borders of socialist countries, and even agreed to meet the expenditures connected with the redeployment, 270 million dollars.

Washington, naturally, is not going to stop its pressure on the allies. The press reports that a special NATO working group on problems of the sharing out of the military expenditures will draft a report by the end of the year. There can be no doubt already now that the recommendations of the report will be reflecting the U.S. stand on problems of NATO rearming, not the European one.

In their Brussels statement, the heads of the military departments of NATO countries assert that they see no changes for the better in Soviet military thinking. And Chairman of the Military Planning Committee West German General Wolfgang Altenburg declared that there are no reasons for lessening NATO military effort.

The results of the session of the NATO Military Planning Committee suggest that defence ministers of the member countries of the alliance deliberately overlook changes taking place in the international arena.

Nonaligned Session Being Held in Havana

Shevardnadze Greets Meeting

LD2705183588 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, has wished in his message of greetings every success in their work to the participants in the meeting of the Coordination Bureau on Disarmament issues of the Nonaligned Movement. The Coordination Bureau meeting is opening in Havana on Saturday with the participation of more than 110 delegations from the nonaligned countries, observers, representatives of national liberation movements, international and regional organizations.

The message of greetings from the Soviet minister of foreign affairs notes that the "efforts of the nonaligned countries, especially the known decisions of the Harare summit conference on ensuring a nuclear-free world and disarmament are of exceptionally great significance for strengthening positive trends in international affairs. The first ever meeting of representatives of the member countries of the movement specially to discuss these problems coincides in time with a crucial period in humanity's development—the start of implementation in practice of new political thinking."

"The awareness of the current political realities and the world's growing interdependence," the message of greetings says, "help towards a more active and specific participation of all countries—both big and small, nuclear and non-nuclear ones—in outlining ways and methods of transition to a safer world. Under these conditions the possibilities of interaction of nonaligned and other states towards normalising the international situation and jointly finding solutions to knotty international problems are considerably broadening."

The USSR minister of foreign affairs voiced hope that the "Havana nonaligned forum will give a tangible impulse to this work in a constructive spirit."

'Appeal' Passed

LD3005082088 Moscow TASS in English 0625 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Havana May 30 TASS—The Coordination Bureau of the Nonaligned Movement passed an appeal to the peoples of the world which stresses the need further to step up the process of disarmament started by the Soviet Union and United States. All nations of the world, the document passed at the extraordinary meeting on disarmament and called "The Havana Appeal," have a vital interest in the success of the disarmament talks.

The document stressed the need further to develop and strengthen the trend for peace, security and development, which was started by the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles.

Noting that general and complete disarmament was the main goal of the Nonaligned Movement in all the years of its existence, the representatives of nonaligned states underscored the urgent need to cut spending on arms and to divert the funds thus released to meet the needs of socio-economic development. Peace and international security, it runs, can be ensured only if the basic principles of peaceful co-existence: non-interference in the internal affairs of each other, refusal to use force in interstate relations, elimination of colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination are strictly observed.

Message to Moscow Summit

LD3005082488 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Havana May 30 TASS—The Coordination of the nonaligned countries addressed a message to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan at its extraordinary meeting on disarmament.

Noting the great significance of the Moscow summit the participants in the meeting pointed out the responsibility which lay on the United States and the Soviet Union for arms cuts and disarmament. On behalf of millions of people they expressed the hope that that responsibility would translate into concrete deeds in the course of the current meeting, primarily into significant cuts of strategic nuclear weapons and a nuclear test ban. Noting with satisfaction the progress achieved at bilateral talks, they stressed the need to step up multisided talks, especially within the UN framework.

Participants in the Havana meeting wished success to the Moscow meeting in stepping up the process of arms reductions and disarmament. They expressed the conviction that its decisions would help defuse international tensions, eliminate the threat of a nuclear war and strengthen peace and international security.

Reagan Visit, INF, Afghan Withdrawal Viewed

PM2905163188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 88 Second Edition p 5

[Boris Orekhov "International Review": "The World This Week"—boldface as published]

[Text] **A few hours after this issue of PRAVDA comes off the presses, a U.S. Air Force Boeing with the identification mark "Air Force One"—the U.S. President's aircraft—will land at Moscow's Vnukovo Airport. About 1 hour later, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan will step toward each other in St. George's Hall in the Kremlin. This will be the beginning of their fourth meeting in the last 2 and 1/2 years, the central event of international life in the last few days.**

Commandment of the Time [subhead]

The ancients were right when they said that all is flux, nothing stays still. "During his first 4 years in office as President, R. Reagan refused even to meet any high-ranking Soviet official representatives," the U.S. newspaper NEWSDAY writes. "He predicted that the Soviet system would ultimately end up on 'the dustheap of history' and called Moscow 'the focus of evil in the contemporary world.' But by the time Reagan meets M.S. Gorbachev on Memorial Day (this day is celebrated in the United States on the last Monday in May—B.O.), he will have had more meetings with a Soviet leader than any other U.S. President."

The visit by the head of the U.S. Administration to our country reflects, of course, both changes in the world and alterations in Washington's views on how to build Soviet-U.S. relations on which the political climate in the planet depends to a considerable extent. The new political thinking proposed by the Soviet leadership is having an increasingly noticeable effect on the development of international affairs. Its shoots are more and more distinctly breaking thorough the thick frost of the "cold war" which, fortunately, proved not to be eternal and is thawing even though, in many cases, not as fast as mankind would like.

There are plenty of conjectures about the possible results of the Moscow summit meeting. That same U.S. press offers assessments to suit all tastes—from expressions of euphoria to displays of gloomy skepticism. Indeed, the situation in the world remains complex. A whole series of regional conflicts have not been eliminated. By no means is everything bright and cheerful in Soviet-U.S. relations themselves. Optimistically inclined observers recall that there are more than 100 scientific and technical agreements in operation between the Soviet Union and U.S. federal departments, and that last year the United States was visited by about 3,000 Soviet representatives and the USSR by 4,000 Americans within the framework of nongovernmental, scientific, cultural, and technical exchanges. A number of new agreements will evidently be signed in Moscow.

All this is perfectly true, but it is equally true that, despite all the efforts by the Soviet side, it has not proved possible to prepare an agreement on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons in time for R. Reagan's Moscow visit—as had previously been the planned intention. The complexities and obstacles (including objective ones) along the way to this agreement proved far more numerous than could have been expected. If this were not enough, what would have seemed to have been a perfectly clear and obvious matter—the ratification of the USSR-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles which was

signed in Washington last December—almost created circumstances which would have placed the U.S. President in a highly ambiguous position. It was at the very last moment, after massive pressure by the White House apparatus and the President himself, that the treaty was successfully ratified by the U.S. Senate. Thus, White House Chief of Staff H. Baker, who even had to delay his departure from Washington to Moscow for this reason, will bring along the desired Senate resolution. Let us note with gratification that the senators expressed almost unanimous support for the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. There were 93 members of the upper chamber of Congress voting for it, with only 5 against. A solid result! Without any doubt, it reflects the moods of the U.S. people and the expectations of the world public.

While this review was being typeset, the news came from the Kremlin: The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium had ratified the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. Now the treaty has been given the green light!

Attention now automatically focuses even more intently on the problems of security, disarmament, and elaboration of new agreements and accords in this sphere. What will the Moscow meeting produce in this regard? Our own people and the other peoples in the world are vitally interested in this question. Especially since the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles proved the feasibility of advance toward a nuclear-free world.

It was announced at a White House briefing a few days ago that, during his Moscow visit, the President intends to visit a monastery which "ought to symbolize U.S. concern over the situation with religious freedoms in the USSR," and that he intends to meet at the U.S. ambassador's residence with dissidents and "refuseniks," which is how people in the United States describe individuals who, for various reasons, have not received permits to leave the USSR and who can now be counted almost on one's fingers. He wants to chat with our representatives of creative professions in the Central House of Writers and to explain to them how he perceives creative freedom.

We will not attempt to guess what precisely our visitor wishes to say in the course of these meetings—this is the President's business and he is, of course, free to choose his audiences and acquaintances. This is, of course, not the main point. The main point is: How realistic and constructive will be the approach adopted by the head of the U.S. Administration and his advisers toward the basic problems, primarily disarmament, which are included on the summit meeting agenda.

Today there is no need to persuade anyone that the continuation of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue at summit level is in itself important and substantial. This dialogue is a commandment of the time, it conforms with the vital interests of our countries' peoples, and it contributes to the deepening of detente and the strengthening of security in the world. And if the participants in the Moscow meeting manage to reach a new level in this dialogue, a new level of mutual understanding, this will be a considerable contribution to the cause of international detente and peace.

Afghan Spring [subhead]

"This spring can with full justification be called the Afghan spring," President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan said at a news conference devoted to the beginning of the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. For 2 weeks now, the television program "Vremya" has been bringing to our homes television reports devoted to the homecoming of Soviet soldiers, reports which touch the heart of every Soviet person.

As for Afghanistan itself, it is entering a new stage of its life. What will this stage be like? How will the process of settlement proceed? What changes lie in store for Afghanistan? The answer to these questions lies in the hands of the Afghan people themselves. The Soviet Union, standing firmly on the principles of noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries and peoples, will of course give Afghanistan help in eliminating the consequences of the war and strengthening the country's economy. It will act in conformity with the long-established traditions of good-neighborliness and friendship with this country, our southern neighbor, respecting its status as an independent, neutral, and nonaligned state.

The Afghan Government has set itself the goal of national reconciliation of the Afghan people and, on this basis, its own reorganization into a coalition government with participation by all opposing sides. The Geneva agreements secured favorable opportunities for the homecoming of Afghan citizens who, by force of diverse circumstances, found themselves as refugees abroad. The government of the Republic of Afghanistan is seriously concerned with the problem of the refugees and their fate. In order to solve questions of a socioeconomic nature, a Ministry for Emigre Affairs has been set up in Kabul with local offices in the provinces. The state budget makes provision for a special fund for the needs of emigres. A series of laws have been passed, under which emigres' property is returned to them, they are given tax benefits, and their civil and political rights are guaranteed.

This policy cannot fail to produce good results. Some 130,000 persons returned home from abroad last year. "We," President Najibullah said, "are preparing to receive 1 million refugees in the immediate future."

The republic's government advocates national reconciliation on the basis of compromises and dialogue with all political forces. It has issued a call for dialogue to leaders of the armed opposition and leaders of emigre political circles.

One of the important results of the policy of national reconciliation is the process of shaping a new state and political system, now successfully under way in the country. Proceeding from the premise that the ranks of the opposition contain sensible people capable of perceiving the needs and aspirations of the Afghan people, the government addresses them with the call: Come to Kabul and sit around the negotiating table. This is a call by a government which has confidence in itself and is profoundly aware of its responsibility for the fate and future of its people who yearn for peace rather than continuation of endless clashes which result in senseless loss of life.

Of course, Afghanistan's future depends largely also on the extent to which all sides that signed the Geneva agreement will honestly and consistently honor the pledges given by them, and will not try to evade them by various means and cheat their partners. Unfortunately, such attempts are being made.

Last week the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan presented to a group of UN observers in Kabul an official note drawing attention to the sharp recent increase in the quantity of weapons and ammunition being brought into Afghanistan by antigovernment groupings from Pakistani territory. In parallel with the importation of weapons, there are instances of illegal infiltration in Afghanistan by foreign military advisers and specialists for the purpose of assisting the extremists. Some 15 detachments of insurgents, numbering about 1,800 men in total, have been moved into Afghanistan during the first half of May alone.

Reports from Delhi speak of attempts by the Pakistani authorities, acting in conjunction with leaders of Afghan reactionary emigre groupings, to hinder the swift return of refugees home. According to the Indian press agency, the majority of Afghans rounded up in refugee camps in Pakistani regions bordering on Afghanistan express the desire to return home as soon as possible. But, on the insistence of a number of leaders of opposition groupings, the refugee camps are surrounded by Pakistani soldiers on watch together with guards from the armed opposition groupings. Seven Pakistani divisions have been placed on a heightened alert in the event of a flareup of disturbances among Afghans in the camps dissatisfied with their delayed return home. Patrols along the border with Afghanistan have been intensified by the Pakistani side. Is it not clear that such actions are a breach of the agreements?

It Must Become the Norm [subhead]

There is still a whole series of regional conflicts in the world which need localization. One of them is in Central America.

The Nicaraguan Government, pursuing a policy of national reconciliation, decided a few days ago to unilaterally extend the duration of the temporary suspension of offensive military operations against the contra gangs for 1 more month from 1 June this year. This decision by the Sandinist government, imbued with the spirit of humanitarianism and good will, offers convincing proof of its desire to achieve peace and an end to the bloodshed in the country.

And what are the contras doing? Their leadership insists, just like before, on the government meeting unacceptable demands which run contrary to the peace accords reached in Sapoa in March of this year. This stance threatens to wreck the peace dialogue.

Here is another news item, even more recent, but this one from Southeast Asia: The Governments of Vietnam and Cambodia have reached accord that a withdrawal of 50,000 men, in other words one-half of the contingent of Vietnamese volunteer troops in Cambodia, will be implemented as early as during this year. The Vietnamese command of the SRV volunteer forces in Cambodia will also be recalled home this year, while the remaining volunteers will be placed under the Cambodian side's orders and will be finally withdrawn in 1990.

These important actions by the Governments of Cambodia and Vietnam are valuable primarily because they pave a direct way toward settling the situation around Cambodia within a brief period, and help to create conditions for the implementation of the course of national reconciliation pursued by the PRK Government and of the idea of turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace.

News like this is encouraging. The world community has already received sufficient proof that the protracted nature of regional conflicts is the result of pressure exerted on on policy by historically obsolete stereotypes like the traditional approaches toward ensuring national security, with preference given to strong-arm methods instead of sensible reckoning and political boldness.

The topic of regional conflicts and the ways and means for their solution is among others on the agenda of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow. Let us hope that its discussion will bring mankind nearer to the point when political settlement of regional conflicts and prevention of new ones will enter the practice of international relations and will become a norm of the world community's life.

United States & Canada

U.S. Senate Approves Military Budget

LD2805100188 Moscow TASS in English 0815 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Washington May 28 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Barsukov reports:

The U.S. Senate on Friday without counting of votes approved a bill on military appropriations for the 1989 fiscal year to the tune of 299,500 million dollars.

The amount was fixed way back at the end of last year when administration and Congress members worked out a compromise version of the bill aimed at gradually reducing the deficit of the federal budget.

A vote on the bill was taken in a practically empty conference hall of the Senate after Republican Senator Alfonse d'Amato withdrew his amendment which provided for death penalty for murders connected with the smuggling of narcotics.

The U.S. House of Representatives adopted its version of the bill more than two weeks ago. Both versions will be now submitted to the House-Senate Committee which is to settle the differences between the proposals of the Senate and the House of Representatives and to endorse a final version of the bill. The most serious arguments in the House-Senate Committee is expected to develop over SDI-related appropriations.

U.S. Human Rights Violations Described

Mayorov on Panama Situation

LD3005174588 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Humanitarian problems are one of the subjects which are being discussed in Moscow at the Soviet-American summit. This is probably why every fact of human rights violations in one country or another is these days felt with special bitterness. Commentary is by Mikhail Mayorov. Here is what he writes:

The case I'm referring to is the violation of one of the rights of a whole people, the Panamanians, who, under the treaty of 1977, should take control of the Panama Canal by the end of this century. The treaty was signed by the former leaders of the United States and Panama, Jimmy Carter and Omar Torrijos.

Today, 11 years after the signing of the document, the United States Administration has launched a massive campaign against Panama, in particular its present leaders, and in the first place against the commander of the National Defense Force, General Manuel Antonio Noriega. To replace him Washington has resorted to trade and economic sanctions against Panama and moved additional troops into the Canal Zone.

As more threats and blackmail are used, it is getting increasingly obvious that the real target of the campaign is not so much Noriega, whom the Americans accuse of involvement in the narcotics business. The real aim is to cross out the formula which says the Panama Canal to the Panamanians, to put in power in that country people who would agree to revise the treaty of 1977. [sentence as received] The game is worth the candle. The canal is important from both the strategic and economic points of view; its zone is a convenient stronghold of the Pentagon.

These days, at the moment the United States' President arrived in the Soviet Union, his adviser for national security, General Colin Powell, and the head of the White House staff, Howard Baker, said in a televised interview in Washington that the United States intends to exert further pressure on Panama, military pressure included. This leaves one to wonder. When the head of the United States Administration speaks about violations of human rights in other countries, does he also mean the 2 million Panamanians who quite unceremoniously are to be kept away from part of their own territory in defiance of international law?

Puerto Rican Prisoners Held

LD3105132888 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] New York May 31 TASS—Long prison terms are being served in the United States by many prominent Puerto Rican public and trade union leaders, intellectuals and students. All of them are members of the Movement for the Independence of Puerto Rico, put behind prison bars under a far-fetched charge of "conspiracy with a view of staging a mutiny" The American authorities bracket them as terrorists only for their struggle for the liberation of their homeland, which became a U.S. colonial territory and a springboard for the Pentagon's military ventures.

A list of Puerto Rican political prisoners was printed by the public organization, the Centre for Constitutional Rights. Among the Puerto Ricans languishing in American jails is Edwin Cortez, one of the founders of the Union of Puerto Rican students, who was sentenced to a 35-year prison term in 1983.

Well-known Puerto Rican painter Elizam Escobar was sentenced to 68 years in prison. His canvases had been repeatedly on view not only in Puerto Rico but also at the biggest exhibition halls of the United States. The prison administration ruled that Escobar be deprived of the right to be engaged in painting in his cell. A 35-year prison term was passed on Alberto Rodriguez, one of the leaders of the Puerto Rican community of Chicago, and activist of the struggle for civil rights of U.S. national minorities.

These are only a few names from the long list which was distributed in the course of a press conference held by a number of public organizations to draw attention to political repressions and violations of human rights in the United States. This list is far from being complete since the precise number of political prisoners at U.S. jails is unknown. The American authorities deny that there are political prisoners in the country and the "free" press prefers to keep silent on such facts.

"The veil of silence" around the "The Puerto Rico/Hartford-15" case, a crying judicial arbitrary rule vis-a-vis 15 activists of the movement for the independence of the island, is a typical example of such a hypocritical approach of the U.S. mass media. The activists were put behind prison bars without trial and with no official charges. The biggest term of the so-called "preventive confinement" fell the lot [as received] of Filiberto Oheda who has been kept in prison for 33 months now, with no sentence passed on him. The bourgeois press bypassed in silence the unprecedented case of American legal practices, just as the broad campaign for the release of Oheda and his comrades.

Should one be therefore surprised at the fact that the majority of the Americans never heard the names of Filiberto Oheda, Leonard Peltier, Jonny Harris and other political prisoners in their country. It is no secret that persistent interest of the American press in the theme of human rights in the USSR and other socialist countries changes in no time over to absolute indifference when the question is raised of violation of human rights in the United States.

'Fabricated Diagnoses' Noted

LD3105032588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0105 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] San Francisco, 31 May (TASS)—"Mr President, so you don't get into a difficult situation on the question of human rights, if they ask you whether the U.S. Government resorts to secret use of false psychiatric conclusions and fabricated diagnoses in order to discredit Americans of left-wing convictions and deprive them of the chance to find work, say: 'Yes.'" This is the beginning of a letter sent to the U.S. President on the eve of his departure for the Moscow summit by American World War II veteran Carrol Shacht, who lives in La Jolla, California.

Shacht, who took part in the Allied landing in Normandy and returned home after the victory over fascist Germany, was put on the FBI "black list" and was the victim of oppression organized against him. The reason was that he called openly for the continuation of the political alliance with the USSR, in order to prevent the appearance on the map of the world of new reichs, and considered the barbaric atomic bombing of the Japanese towns of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to be a crime against humanity. As Shacht discovered decades later from declassified secret service material, he had been put on a list of "dangerous and potentially subversive elements sympathetic to Communism." With the aim of "neutralizing" him, the special "T-2" section of the FBI "recommended" that the U.S. Veterans Administration describe Shacht confidentially as "schizophrenic and paranoic" every time requests came in for job references for him.

Only in 1975 did the Veterans Administration tell Shacht that it had given these libelous character references about him, and admit that the "diagnosis" about him was "incorrect". But by that time the fate of Shacht and his family was ruined. In spite of the fact that Shacht had graduated from one of the most prestigious colleges in the United States, Yale University, and had earned a B.A. in architecture, he was then not only unable to work at his favorite subject, but was, to use his words, "deprived of equal rights to get any kind of work at all."

According to Shacht, he is only one of many dissident Americans who, because of their political views which do not suit Washington, were defamed and subjected to oppression as "socially dangerous schizophrenics". So the United States has no moral right to give other countries lessons in observing human rights, thinks Carrol Shacht.

U.S.-Soviet Trade Reflects 'Cold War Times'

LD3005072788 Moscow TASS in English 0714 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—The real possibility of an improvement of political relations between the USA and the USSR necessitates a new appraisal of the state of bilateral trade, which is, so far, as a matter of fact, a survival of the cold war times. Indeed, since 1984 trade between the two countries has been on a decline: Soviet commodities account for only 0.5 per cent of the U.S. imports, while the USA makes only one per cent of the USSR's foreign trade.

The causes of that are known: In the first place the refusal of the USA to grant the USSR the most favoured nation treatment in trade, which dooms the Soviet commodities to discriminatory taxation, predetermines the USSR's unfavourable balance in bilateral trade.

The U.S. Administration does not guarantee credits for the development of trade with the USSR which does not permit the U.S. companies to compete on a par with rivals in the bid for big Soviet orders. One cannot help mentioning the notorious Cocom lists, which have turned into a serious impediment to East-West trade.

There is also another cause behind that: After the sharp turns in bilateral trade, the embargoes and broken off contracts American businessmen had developed some kind of a complex of inconfidence in their own administration's intentions. And the scanty trade turnover, the almost total exclusion of the Soviet commodities from the U.S. market, the lack of orders from the USSR

placed in the U.S. enterprises mean that common Americans simply do not feel interest in developing trade with the USSR (with the exception of the inhabitants of the "grain belt" of the USA). All that, indisputably, tells on the mood among the top echelons of power in the USA, including in Congress.

But the potential of trade is vast: Thus in the opinion of James Giffen, president of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council, if political barriers were removed, Soviet-American trade could reach 15-20 billion dollars already within the next two or three years. An important contribution to it could be made by joint ventures in the USSR's territory with the participation of U.S. big business. Soviet legislation in that field is steadily perfected.

Soviet people voice hope that the visit to the USSR of the U.S. President will make it possible to deep mutual understanding and lay the groundwork for the development of trade. And the world's two most powerful nations which have proved to be able to start the process of real disarmament, begin a serious dialogue for the settlement of regional conflicts, will be able at last to normalise relations in the trade-economic field.

Yakovlev Receives Soviet, U.S. Veterans

Participants Named

LD3005161488 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received today a group of Soviet and American World War II veterans, participants in the meeting on the Elbe in April 1945—W. Robertson, K. Djemre, V. Orlov, A. Olshanskiy and A. Silvashko.

Participants in the historic meeting handed in a letter of appeal addressed by them to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in connection with the Soviet-American summit meeting.

Welcoming the Moscow meeting as an event of a major international significance on the way to the creation of a safe world, "true to the ideals of peace, we express hope that the Soviet-American dialogue on a summit level will be held in the 'spirit of the Elbe', reflecting the striving of nations for a better future without wars, for the ridding of humanity of the threat of nuclear catastrophe", the appeal to the leaders of the two countries said. The veterans handed over as well a book of memoirs of Soviet and American participants in World War II entitled "Meeting on the Elbe". It was brought out simultaneously in the Soviet Union and the U.S. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its Second Edition on 31 May carries on page 2 a similar report on this meeting. The PRAVDA report adds that the talks passed in a "warm, friendly atmosphere."]

Message Sent to Gorbachev

LD3005203788 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Disarmament and peace are the dream of the people of the earth, the path to the survival of mankind. The participants in the Elbe meeting call on you to continue cooperation to achieve this great goal, says a message sent to Mikhail Gorbachev by the Soviet and American veterans of the Second World War. They held today a joint meeting at the international public center for watching the summit meeting.

Welcoming the Moscow meeting, the veterans described it as an "event of big international significance on the road to a safe world".

Our countries and peoples, the message says, are convinced that they can overcome the obstacles in the way toward mutual trust and fruitful cooperation as this was done during the years of our joint struggle against Nazism. True to the ideals of peace, we express the hope that the Soviet-American dialogue at the summit level will be conducted in the "spirit of Elbe", reflecting the peoples' aspirations for a better future, a future without wars, and for a mankind freed from the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

We approve of the Soviet-American INF Treaty and warmly support the efforts to solve the question of 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive arms and to achieve progress in all fields of Soviet-American cooperation, the message says.

Deputy Foreign Minister Receives U.S. Scientists

LD3005181988 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev today received Carl Linden, director of the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies at George Washington University, and his deputy Kim Young, in Moscow at the invitation of the Institute of the Far East at the USSR Academy of Sciences.

American Citizens Received in Yerevan

LD3005222788 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Yerevan May 30 TASS—We take away with us the warmest recollections of the hospitable people in Armenia and we wish to develop further the links between our twin cities—Cambridge and Yerevan, Debra Walsh, a member of the U.S. "Cambridge-Yerevan" association said in an interview with a TASS correspondent. Debra Walsh, a former well-known U.S. tennis player headed a delegation of Cambridge scientists (Massachussetts) which left the capital of Soviet Armenia today.

During the visit the delegation had meetings in the republic's academy of sciences and at Yerevan University. The delegation were received by the catolicos of all Armenians, Vazgen the First and the head of the Ararat Diocese Garegin Nersisyan.

Academic, Worker on Cooperation With U.S.

LD3005221388 Moscow TASS in English 2103 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—"The peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States should more boldly and energetically go to meet each other," maintains Yuriy Yershov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, rector of Novosibirsk University (Western Siberia).

It is in our common interests to pool efforts in the fields of the economy, science, culture and ecology," Yuriy Yershov continued his thought in an interview with a TASS correspondent. Without mutual understanding, without mutual steps to bring our peoples closer together, it is difficult to tackle the main problems and first of all the task of eliminating nuclear weapons. "This is why," he said, "we follow with great hopes the meetings between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan."

The scientists' concern for the future of the world has found reflection in the idea of directly including the prestige of science in world politics. The constructive policy of the Soviet Union, which lives in an atmosphere of perestroyka, democratisation and glasnost, also creates good prerequisites for the development of contacts between scientific centres and educational establishments. Our university is actively joining this process.

The students of the physico-mathematical school at the university have already visited twice their co-evals in the Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachussets, and, for their part, played host to young Americans. The beginning was also set for exchanges of students with Stanford University, California.

The opinion of Hero of Socialist Labour Georgiy Rodin, a steel maker from Taganrog, is as follows: "The Soviet Union and the United States of America had bright and bitter pages in the history of their relations. We remember how American engineers helped to build the first Soviet factories. We jointly fought against the Nazis, and shook hands in outer space. But there were also decades of mutual distrust and suspiciousness, which cannot be overstepped at once. Our peoples' aspiration for peace is great nowadays. It has also manifested itself in the efforts of the two countries' leaders aimed at finding the only right road of mutual understanding. Let there be many good meetings along the road."

Results of U.S. Poll of Muscovites Cited

Support for CPSU Policies

LD3105101088 Moscow TASS in English 0946 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The returns of a public opinion poll have demonstrated that a majority of the Muscovites (78 percent) fully support the CPSU's home policy, said Dr.Sc. (Philosophy) Vilen Ivanov, director of the Sociological Research Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. He was commenting on the returns of the public opinion poll carried out by the institute in May at the request of the newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES. Vilen Ivanov was addressing the summit Press Centre today. A total of 1,939 Muscovites have expressed on the phone their views on various aspects of the home and foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government on the phone.

Most pollees consider glasnost and the drive for more democracy to be the key elements of perestroyka. Yet the interpretation of these notions is so far not the same with all people. Asked whether the situation of pluralism of views helps people form their views on all the current issues or hampers them in a degree, 56.7 percent of the pollees answered positively and 16 percent answered negatively. More than 85 percent of the Muscovites are of the opinion that the policy of glasnost will help towards the development of socialism in the USSR.

Noting that the essence of perestroyka is not only glasnost and the drive for more democracy, but is linked with the living standards of the people, the Soviet sociologist said that 46.3 percent of the pollees have noticed positive change in that field, and 42.8 percent have not noticed any, 4.8 percent believe that there has been negative change.

As far as the living standards of the families in recent years are concerned most people have so far felt neither positive nor negative changes (52.6 percent), hence it follows that there will be plenty of work to do in that field.

The possibility of price rises even if the quality of products is bettered causes a guarded attitude as the returns of the poll have shown. In case of a considerable improvement of the quality of foodstuffs and consumer goods, 21.1 percent of the people would agree to an increase in the prices. Twenty-nine percent of the pollees have declared against a reform of the prices. "The reform of prices is a measure that is unpopular as a rule. If such a step is undertaken, this will be done only after a preliminary discussion by the broad sections of the population," Vilen Ivanov said in conclusion.

'Good Feelings' Toward U.S.

LD3105092588 Moscow TASS in English [illegible] GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The newspaper "THE NEW YORK TIMES" used data of the Sociological Research Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences, to learn the opinion of Soviet people on the state of and prospects for Soviet-American relations and the progress of perestroika in the USSR, Vilen Ivanov, D.Sc. (Philosophy), told today a briefing at the summit Press Centre.

He said that the institute had polled by phone 1939 Moscow residents. 22 questions dealt with various aspects of Soviet-American relations. The poll showed that the overwhelming majority of Soviet people entertain good or very good feelings towards the USA (70 per cent) and Americans (78 per cent). Only 3.6 and 1.1 per cent of the polled have a negative or very negative attitude to the United States and Americans. As for the dynamics of Soviet-American relations, 36 per cent of Muscovites believe that they have considerably improved and 53 per cent—that they have somewhat improved. Only three in 100 of the polled hold the opinion that relations between the USSR and the USA have changed for the worse in the past years.

The Moscow summit may become an important step towards improvement in Soviet-American relations, is a reply of 70 per cent of Soviet people. Asked who is stronger militarily, 13 per cent favoured the USSR, 10—the USA, forces are approximately equal—50 per cent and other replies—27.

A total of 96 per cent of the polled are of the opinion that the USSR and the USA should seek an agreement on strategic offensive weapons.

In the recent past the majority of Soviet people changed their attitude to President Reagan for the better (52 per cent).

Vilen Ivanov also described the results of the poll concerning the attitude of Soviet people to the domestic policies of the CPSU and the government.

Ignatyev Analyzes Irangate Trial Preparations

LD2705163888 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Washington May 27 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev:

A trial of the persons, who were involved in the Iran-contras affair, is again in question. The status of "limited immunity" against criminal prosecution, which was granted by the U.S. Congress to John Poindexter, Oliver North and Albert Hakim in the open hearings into the Irangate affair, makes practically impossible their trial on a charge of criminal collusion. Gerhard Gesell, federal district judge of the city of Washington, made a statement on that at the hearings on Thursday to examine the problems cropping up in the course of preparations for the trial.

The point is that each of the defendants trying to plead innocence may use evidence by the other participants in the White House secret affair, who were granted the status of "limited immunity." But the prosecutors may not, according to the law, use that testimony as incriminating evidence. The line of the defence attorneys of the four main characters involved in the clandestine Iran-contras operation is precisely to turn down the charges made by the federal grand jury on the grounds that special attorney Lawrence Walsh violated—wittingly or unwittingly—the "limited immunity" granted to their clients. John Poindexter, a former assistant to the President for national security affairs, Oliver North, a former high ranking official on the staff of the National Security Council, businessman Albert Hakim and retired General Richard Secord have been charged on a total of 23 counts.

Judge Gerhard Gesell raised the question whether the Congress decision to grant limited immunity to the three of the defendants is an action that will prevent instituting criminal procedure against them.

A spokesman for the special attorney stressed at the hearings that a "fair" trial is quite possible on the strength of the materials which the prosecution already has. L. Walsh said earlier that he would be ready for the start of the trial in July this year. Yet as the latest hearings have borne out once again, influential forces are making desperate efforts to postpone or even prevent a trial.

'Calling Moscow' Radio Link Set Up With U.S.

LD2805100788 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 27 May 88

["Calling Moscow" program, third in series of radio links between Moscow Radio and KPPS-FM, San Diego; Pavel Kuznetsov introduces the program from Moscow, and (Doug Waldo) from San Diego; questions are answered by Radomir Bogdanov, Sergey Plekhanov, and Vladimir Pozner]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Words indistinct] [(Waldo)] I think many Americans are interested in this, and they would probably like to know exactly for what these persons were arrested.

[Plekhanov] Allow me to elucidate a little bit on that issue. The people who came together to create this new party, which they call the Democratic Union, there were about a hundred of these people. They spent 2 days assembling in homes and apartments in Moscow, and then they travelled about 15 miles from Moscow to a rural area where they wanted to have their—call it

convention, if you wish. Now none of these people—and I'm saying this as a journalist who knows—none of these people were touched, let alone arrested. The noise has been about one man specifically, whose name is Mr Grigoryants, and who is the editor of a magazine/newspaper called GLASNOST, who was involved in organizing this group at a country house. He was not even part of the group; he had nothing to do with the party itself, but he was active in bringing them to this place where they could assemble. And there were police there, and there was some shoving and pushing, and as a result of that Grigoryants was taken into custody for what we would call law and order reasons, and he was held for 7 days, and released. So that...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] I guess the question would be then, why were the police there initially?

[Plekhanov] Officially, the police were there initially because they said, the people living in that area, that Grigoryants, this man, was disturbing the peace having a 100 people come in and making a lot of noise, and trampling the grass, and whatnot. Now how legitimate that is, is another question. But what I want to make very clear is that these 100 people or so who were there to create this party were not touched in any way, were not arrested, were not harassed. The person who got into trouble was Grigoryants. He was released after 7 days. No court proceedings were involved. So moving into democracy is not an easy thing. There will be contradictions, there will definitely be problems, but these problems and contradictions should not be interpreted in the West as meaning we're not moving in the right direction. Similarly, when we see things that we don't consider to be too democratic in any other society, including U.S. society—and you can find those things—they are not a reason for us to say: Your democratic process does not exist.[passage omitted]

[(Waldo)] (Esti)—I hope I'm pronouncing that right—is our next caller, (Esti), go ahead:

[(Esti)] Hi! I want to say first that I listen to the program on shortwave, and I'm a regular listener to a program called "Top Priority," which is a panel program by the same panel we have here. I'm very excited and very grateful to the station for this wonderful opportunity. My question is: Just as the enemy image is starting to change and the excitement is mounting about the coming summit, comes suddenly Reagan's speech today, which is repeating the enemy image. And I talked to several people today about it, and the feeling I got is that people here think that this is the wrong approach and at the wrong time, and also some people said that it's hypocritical to keep accusing your country of human rights abuses as if it's an unknown phenomenon here. And to go back to the last question, people [words indistinct] but still (?these were the) people I talked to, but I think that most, or at least many people here still think that the Soviet Union is an evil empire, etc, and this kind of speech was really the wrong thing at the wrong time. I was wondering what did the Soviets in general feel about it this morning, and also what does the panel have to say to it?

[(Waldo)] Right, thanks for calling.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, now who is going to answer this one? This lady was talking about President Reagan's speech in Helsinki, Finland. Professor Bogdanov, do you agree it was an anti-Soviet speech?

[Bogdanov] Yes, I do agree with that, but let me say we are not so much bothered by that because I'm sorry to say we are so much used to some unexpected Presidential speeches that this one doesn't add too much to his image [chuckles]; let me put it that way. But as a professional in the Soviet-American field, in the field of the Soviet-American relations, I would rather attribute that to your domestic politics. And I'm sorry to say, it means that the President doesn't feel too secure that he has all the time to say to his own political (?base) I'm with you, I'm okay [words indistinct], I am the (?same). That's my reading of his speech, though I don't like it, of course; he doesn't (?stay) [word indistinct].

[Plekhanov] Yes, well, I'd like to add to that. I can understand, I mean, the feelings of the President who has just been, you know, wounded politically by General Noriega, who just walked out of negotiations with him, and on the other hand there is a delay in the U.S. Congress concerning ratification, and hopefully there will be ratification....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] There was ratification.

[Plekhanov] Well, there's still the [words indistinct] hasn't brought the special delivery yet. And so there is an understandable need to feel strong, and the only way that the President thinks he can feel strong is, as I (?understand), maybe I'm wrong, is to sound tough on the Russians, I mean to get into the fire and brimstone concerning human rights violations, in the Soviet Union, and so on.

[Bogdanov] You mean to say that in a way we are a victim of Gen Noriega? [all laugh] [passage omitted]

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Government Statement on SRV Withdrawal

LD2905141488 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1300 GMT 29 May 88

["Statement by the Soviet Government"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 29 May (TASS)—The Soviet Government made a statement today which reads:

"The other day the SRV and PRK Governments announced their decision to withdraw 50,000 Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodia in 1988, that is half the personnel of the SRV military contingent in this country. The command of the Vietnamese volunteer forces in Cambodia is being transferred to the SRV and the leadership of those remaining has been handed over to the PRK. In order to set up a peace zone along the Cambodian-Thai border it has also been decided to pull back the Vietnamese subunits 30 km from it. Representatives of governments and international organizations and of all those who show an interest in the Cambodian problem are invited to observe the troop withdrawal.

The Soviet Union views the decision by the SRV and PRK Governments as a major constructive contribution to a settlement of the regional conflict in Southeast Asia and the process of eliminating military tension and returning the situation in this region of the world to normality. This action is being undertaken without any kind of conditions. It is completely in line with the efforts of all those interested in the speediest solution of the Cambodian problem. It is quite obvious that the basis of the decision is concern for the genuine interests of the Cambodian people and a regard for the balance of interests of all states in the region.

Such a major reduction in the contingent of Vietnamese units confirms that the SRV Government's words correspond with its deeds, and that it is consistently carrying out its declared intention to remove all Vietnamese troops from Cambodia in 1990.

The step taken by the governments of the two friendly countries also testifies to the further stabilization of the internal political, social, and economic situation in Cambodia; it demonstrates Vietnam's respect for the sovereignty and independence of People's Kampuchea.

There can be no doubt that the new initiative is creating favorable opportunities for further developing the dialogue between Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, and Prince N. Sihanouk, and for conducting negotiations by all the Cambodian sides, taking into account the known accord between Vietnam and Indonesia.

The Soviet Union welcomes and completely supports the important action by the SRV and PRK Governments which is opening up new opportunities on the path toward a political settlement of the situation surrounding Cambodia in the spirit of national reconciliation, on the basis of recognition of the existing realities, and with the participation of all forces that are involved in the conflict in one way or another. Vietnam and Cambodia are taking a big step toward meeting the other side halfway. Now much will depend on the response.

The Soviet Union is prepared to actively assist, with all interested states, the quest for constructive outcomes to the conflict in Southeast Asia, and in asserting peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Commentary Views Pullout

BK3105100388 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 30 May 88

[Station commentary]

[Text] Cambodia recently marked remembrance day in memory of those who lost their lives because of the genocidal regime. The whole world is well aware of the suffering endured by the Cambodian people during the Pol Pot era. In this context, the victories scored by the PRK [People's Republic of Kampuchea] since January 1979 are doubly significant. Newspapers, radios, and television of the Soviet Union, Vietnam, Laos, and other fraternal countries have often reported on the good changes in Cambodian society and on Cambodia's economic, cultural, scientific, and technical progress.

When talking about these victories, Cambodian leaders and workers of the republic have observed with profound gratitude that a most important factor in the republic's progress since January 1979 is the presence in the country of Vietnamese Army volunteers. The Soviet people and Cambodia's friends the world over highly value the courage of those Vietnamese combatants who are currently carrying out internationalist duties in a fraternal country. Through this act, they are continuing the tradition of mutual assistance, which has tied the two countries' people since the time when they were fighting against colonialists and imperialists.

In the past few years, there have been frequent attempts to falsify the true nature of Cambodian-Vietnamese relations and to exaggerate the presence of Vietnamese Army volunteers on Cambodian soil. This slanderous campaign is still going on even after Vietnam several years ago detailed a program for pulling out its forces phase by phase until all its troops have been withdrawn by 1990. The SRV Government never says things lightly. If it says something, it will implement it. To again illustrate this is the decision to repatriate this year half of Vietnamese Army volunteers present in Cambodia and a number of other measures which really focus on the Cambodian people's interests with those of all states in the region taken into account.

This decision has been noted by the Soviet Government in its statement as a constructive contribution toward resolving conflicts in Southeast Asia, ending military tension, and normalizing the situation in this part of the globe. This act, which is being implemented unconditionally, is in complete agreement with efforts of those who want to resolve the Cambodian problem very quickly.

The Moscow Radio commentator continues: The principled stand of the Soviet Union on regional conflicts lies in how to resolve these conflicts, no matter how complicated and recalcitrant they are, and to resolve them politically. During recent talks in Moscow with the Thai Prime Minister, Soviet leader Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out that the Cambodian issue should be resolved peacefully. It is necessary to settle this issue by acknowledging the current real situation, with the participation of all forces involved in the conflict. Vietnam and Cambodia also adhere to this stand. Illustrating this is the recent meeting in Moscow between Soviet and Vietnamese foreign ministers and the Vietnam-Cambodia decision on troop pullout.

In the Soviet Union, the people welcome and fully support this important step which opens new possibilities on the path toward settling politically the situation around Cambodia. In the Soviet Government's statement, it is stressed that Vietnam and Cambodia are taking a big step toward each other. The current situation largely depends on the reaction expressed toward this step. The Soviet Union, together with all countries interested in this issue, is ready to actively push toward the search for a solution to the conflict in Southeast Asia in a constructive spirit beneficial to the building of peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Impact on PRC Ties

PM3005151388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 88 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report followed by A. Lyutyy commentary under the general heading: "Troops Set To Withdraw"]

[Text] Hanoi, 26 May—The Governments of Vietnam and Cambodia have reached agreement that 50,000 men, or one-half of the contingent of Vietnamese volunteer forces in Cambodia, will be withdrawn this year. This was announced today by an official SRV National Defense Ministry spokesman to a news conference for Vietnamese and foreign jounalists in Hanoi.

A communique issued by the Vietnamese National Defense Ministry says that the troop withdrawal will take place June through December by land and by sea. Moreover, the SRV and PRK Governments agreed that the Vietnamese Command of the SRV volunteer forces in Cambodia will also be recalled this year. The remaining volunteers will be placed in the charge of the Cambodian side and will be finally withdrawn in 1990.

An SRV Foreign Ministry statement on the problem notes that the forthcoming withdrawal of such a large contingent of Vietnamese volunteers is striking new evidence of the ongoing stabilization of the situation in Cambodia and strengthening of the republic's armed forces. It serves as a confirmation of the constant policy of Vietnam, which consistently respects the independence and sovereignty of the PRK, and of its determination to complete the withdrawal of forces in 1990.

The SRV Government, the statement says, fully supports the PRK Government's proposal on setting up a peace zone along the Cambodian-Thai border and on the repatriation of Cambodian refugees.

Vietnam, the document points out, is seeking a political settlement of the Cambodian issue. [TASS report ends]

[A. Lyutyy commentary] At a briefing Thursday [26 May] USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.A. Rogachev said that the constructive new initiatives of the SRV and the PRK are geared to unraveling the conflict situation around Cambodia. The decisions made show the strength of the PRK Government's positions and the stabilization of the situation in the country. The Soviet Union, the speaker said, fully supports these important actions by the PRK and SRV Governments and believes that they open up a direct route to the rapid settlement of the Cambodian situation and to the creation of conditions for the implementation of the idea of turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace.

Answering a PRAVDA correspondent's question, I.A. Rogachev said that the Soviet Union would welcome direct talks between Hanoi and Beijing on the normalization of relations. Vietnam has repeatedly put forward proposals on this score.

We are by and large satisfied, Academician Ye.M. Primakov noted, with the development of relations with the PRC, and of late we have registered substantial shifts in that area. And if the steps now being taken by Vietnam provide the impetus for the further development of our relations we would certainly welcome it.

Near East & South Asia

'Text' of Statement on Afghan-Pakistan Accords

PM2905122788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 88 Morning Edition p 5

["USSR Foreign Ministry Statement"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] The signing of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan, which represent a package of concrete and balanced commitments for achieving a political settlement of the situation around that country, produced a broad positive response from the world community. The latter quite justifiably received the accords reached in Geneva as a basic step, a turning point in unblocking one of the most acute and protracted regional conflicts, which opens the way toward a complete and comprehensive solution of the Afghan problem in all its aspects.

However, 2 weeks have passed since the entry into force of the Geneva accords, and the optimism that accompanied the completion of the Geneva diplomatic process, is increasingly yielding place to bewilderment and disappointment felt by all the peace forces which sincerely wish to see an end to the bloodshed and the establishment of stability in the long-suffering land of Afghanistan.

Like any other international agreements, the documents signed in Geneva assume a practical sense and significance only if strictly complied with by all sides participating in them. It is in this manner, strictly and responsibly, that the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan approach the Geneva accords. This is attested to by the withdrawal from Afghanistan, during the first 2 weeks following the entry of the accords into force, of army units numbering 10,000, with their fighting equipment and arms. The withdrawal of Soviet troops was observed by dozens of foreign correspondents who stayed with those troops. In addition, all the necessary conditions were created for the representatives of the U.N. control mechanism to register the beginning of the withdrawal and its parameters.

One gets the impression that the other participants in the Geneva accords still regard implementing them as "playing into one goal," actually trying to reduce the whole thing solely to the observance of the dates and stages of the withdrawal of the limited Soviet troops contingent. This approach to the Geneva accords has no legal grounds whatsoever but constitutes a direct encroachment upon, an attempt to torpedo, what has been so painstakingly achieved in Geneva.

It should be recalled that the basis for the Geneva accords, their pivot, is the provision on ending the interference in the internal Afghan affairs from the territory of Pakistan. It was only within the context of the commitments included in the Afghan-Pakistani agreement on non-interference, that it also became possible to agree on the question of the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

However, the accords signed in Geneva are not being fulfilled by Pakistan. The outside interference in the Afghan internal affairs, far from ceasing by May 15, had even increased. Being grossly violated is Article Two of the bilateral Afghan-Pakistani agreement on the principles of mutual relations, and, in particular, on non-interference and renunciation of intervention, which lists concrete measures to end the interference.

Not to make unsubstantiated statements, one can cite concrete facts. Thus, for instance, the official Pakistani Government organizations ensure an unobstructed transfer of units of the armed Afghan opposition as well as of caravans with arms through the numerous mountain passes, including Gakgai [placename as published], Shingara, Lavanroi [placename as published], Arandu, and others. Intensive use for these purposes is also made of the caravan routes going through the Khyber, Kurram, and Bolan mountain passes. During May 16 and subsequent days over 100 vehicles were dispatched from Islamabad to the transit bases in the area of the border towns of Parachinar and Landi-Kotal, carrying military cargo for the Afghan opposition, including rocket projectiles, and antiaircraft and antitank means. Operating around-the-clock are the storage facilities of the Pakistani Army in Havelian, Kohat, and Nowshera, from which the Pakistani military transports carry arms and ammunition intended for the Afghan antigovernment forces to border areas.

In Pakistani territory there continue to operate the headquarters organizing the combat operations in the territory of Afghanistan, as well as the information and propaganda centers of the Afghan antigovernment groupings which engage without obstruction in an unbridled anti-Afghan campaign full of slanderous inventions.

The central headquarters of the armed opposition, which is part of the "Alliance of Seven" situated on Pakistani territory, operates following its usual routine.

Still undismantled and operational in Pakistan are the centers for training the detachments of rebels and saboteurs, and large armed formations of the "alliance" are also there. On May 21 the Pakistani authorities "recommended" that the leadership of the "alliance" step up its shipments of arms and ammunition into Afghan territory.

The listing of such flagrant violations of the Geneva accords, as cited here, is far from complete, and it can be complemented by other factual material.

The interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan by Pakistan continues to take the most diverse shapes and forms, including crude anti-Afghan pronouncements at the official level as well. Insulting attacks are made against the lawful Government of the Republic of Afghanistan and President Najibullah. The armed opposition is actually calling for a continuation of active hostilities against Kabul. Contrary to the spirit and letter of the Geneva agreements, the Pakistani side, including at the official level, states that the shipments of arms to the Afghan opposition must be continued. It should be said that the bellicose mood of the Pakistani leadership is backed up by lavish supplies of U.S. arms to Pakistan, intended specifically for the antigovernment Afghan forces, which does not serve the goals of ending the fratricidal war between the Afghans.

In light of the above, it appears to be utterly natural if the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan, faced with such clear and evident violation by Pakistan of the provisions of the Geneva accords, should draw pertinent conclusions with respect to the timetable of the troop withdrawal and take concrete steps, caused by the illicit actions of Islamabad. In any case, if the Pakistani side does not adopt appropriate measures to end interference

in the internal affairs of Afghanistan from its territory, the Soviet Union reserves itself the right to react to this in a manner as warranted by the situation. One would wish to hope that the Pakistani leadership will show common sense and realism and do everything for the strict implementation of the Geneva accords.

Pakistan Viewed as 'Violating' Geneva Agreements
LD3005201788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 30 May 88

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Sergey Pravdin]

[Text] Among the whole range of questions to be discussed by the two heads of state, the Moscow summit includes on its agenda such complex problems as settling regional conflicts. The peoples of the world are hoping that very responsible judgments will be made in Moscow during these next few days aimed at localizing a whole number of regional conflicts. As is known, the first test has been applied. By that I mean the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, which led to the widest positive reaction throughout the world. However, today we are coming up against a situation where optimism is more and more being replaced by disappointment. Two weeks have passed since these agreements came into force, but in reality what is happening is that only Afghanistan and our own country are sticking to the letter and the spirit of the documents signed in Geneva. Blood continues to be shed in Afghanistan, and it continues because Pakistan is not fulfilling the agreements it has signed. I shall ask my colleague, the commentator Vladimir Fadeyev, to give his opinion on this.

[Fadeyev] Yes, indeed, the situation that has developed since the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan came into force today reminds one of a one-sided game. In connection with this, the USSR Foreign Ministry statement of 29 May was published in which our government, first, pointed out to the Pakistani side a whole range of instances where they not only failed to observe, but are also violating the clauses of the bilateral Afghan-Pakistani agreement, and, second, warned Pakistan that if it did not take the necessary measures to end the interference from its territory in Afghanistan's internal affairs, we would reserve the right to react to this as the situation required. So, on the subject of the developing situation, I would like to make a few comments of my own, or rather observations, since I only just got back from Kabul the other day.

The inhabitants of the Afghan capital—like the inhabitants of provincial centers and villages—have virtually every day been experiencing for themselves increasing armed pressure from the so-called irreconcilable since the coming into force of the international agreements on Afghanistan. Day and night, missiles and shells rain on the peaceful inhabitants, explosions thunder in densely populated areas, and acts of terrorism are carried out against the supporters of national reconciliation.

The documents signed in Geneva gave the Afghan people hope that the long-awaited peace would come and that they could again meet up with their relatives who had been wandering around for years as refugees on alien soil. The beginning of the withdrawal of the Soviet troops strengthened their belief that the rebels would surely now have no grounds for justifying their actions. It is a well-known fact that the opposition has used the fact of the presence of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan as a pretext to continue the armed conflict.

However, I repeat, that nothing of the kind has happened. As far as Pakistan is concerned, it is as though Geneva never happened, that there was no long and difficult road toward it, and that there were no efforts by many politicians and governments. Just as before, if not more intensively, caravans with weapons arrive for the rebels, and this is all being done with the immediate participation of Pakistani Government organizations. They are allocating hundreds of vehicles specially to deliver all kinds of armaments and weapons to Afghan anti-government groupings.

It would, then, be naive to believe that Islamabad is showing the door—in accordance with the signed agreements, it was obliged to do so—to the rebels and saboteurs who have long overstayed their welcome. On the contrary, Pakistan is urging and encouraging the opposition leaders to escalate their combat operations. This is being told by those who have decided to break away from their former bosses and come over to the side of the people's power. Incidentally, such instances have become more frequent of late insofar as the measures taken by the government aimed at restoring peace in the country have had an impact even on those who are in the opposition's lair.

I cannot but recall the fact that the bellicose mood not only of the Peshawar seven but also of the Pakistani leaders is clearly evident in the radio broadcasts and on leaflets produced in Pakistan. In a word, it is precisely now, when the Afghan people are entering upon a new and difficult stage of life, when they are faced with a host of problems and questions, and when it is necessary to begin eliminating the consequences of the war and not to continue it, that one of the sides that placed its signature under the Geneva agreements is trying to bypass them one way or another, and in this way to force its partner to do the same.

I do not think that the present government in Afghanistan has weak nerves and that it will submit to these provocations, although I do not rule out that the Afghan people will in the long term react to all these actions accordingly. I will point out that it has the right to use assistance from its friends.

Biryukov on Pakistan President's News Conference
LD3005164588 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

President Ziaul Haq of Pakistan addressed Chinese journalists in Islamabad. His pronouncements confirm the intentions of the Pakistani military regime to continue the flagrant interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan despite the Geneva agreements on a political settlement.

Regarding the implementation of the Geneva agreements as 'playing into one goal', the president virtually reduced it to one question, as he put it, 'the first and main question—the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan.'

Arbitrarily interpreting the agreements, he did not mention by a single word that they are based on termination of interference and intervention from Pakistani territory in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, although the withdrawal of Soviet troops is known to have become possible precisely within the context of appropriate obligations of the Pakistani side under the Geneva agreements.

Moreover, the head of the Pakistani regime openly proclaimed, virtually, a course towards stepping up interference in the affairs of Afghanistan by stating that Pakistan would do all that is within its power to render moral and political support (to the Mujahidin) so that a government of the people's own choice could be formed in Afghanistan. By 'people' Islamabad means the so-called Alliance of Seven. Having assumed the right to speak on behalf of the Afghan people, the general stated that the people of Afghanistan should have a government of their own choice which they would trust. As if the status of Ziaul Haq himself, who came to power as a result of the military coup and the overthrow of the lawfully elected government, in Pakistan is indisputable. His latest action to dissolve the government and parliament does not add laurels to the head of the regime as exponent of the will of the people. On the contrary, rather. It only confirms how the regime 'values' the trust of the people in its own country.

President Ziaul Haq is painting quite a simplified picture of creating in neighbouring country a regime convenient to him with the aid of the armed Afghan opposition being fostered by Islamabad and its patrons.

"When the Russian troops withdraw", he maintains, "there will be a fight for power. I hope the Mujahidin will win and therefore Mr Najibullah will have to go, and if that takes place, all the refugees will go back".

But the head of the Islamabad regime does quite the opposite of what would create conditions in Afghanistan for the return of refugees. Such conditions are being created by the national reconciliation policy which is being consistently implemented in that country and which enjoys growing trust not only among the masses of Afghan people inside Afghanistan but also among the Afghan emigration.

The Pakistani authorities do everything to prevent national reconciliation and to give still greater scope to the bloodshed in the neighbouring country. It is the goal that is being served by the massive delivery, being arranged by them, of arms and ammunition from Pakistan to Afghanistan after the Geneva agreements entered into force. The purposes of stepping up armed interference are also being served by on-going activity of the centres for the training of insurgents and saboteurs in Pakistan and by the formation of new and new detachments of armed opposition there.

At present the extremists, who are being provoked by calls from Islamabad "to fight till a victory is achieved", are fighting not against Soviet troops any longer, as they kept saying until now, but against their own Afghan people, spilling the blood of civilians by means of American and other foreign weapons and destroying the already scant material resources of Afghanistan.

That "fight till a victory is achieved" only multiplies the number of refugees and, of course, does not bring nearer the prospect of their return home.

It is in vain that Islamabad expects that it will get away with such unceremonious trampling on the agreements signed by Pakistan and with the continuation of the interference in the affairs of Afghanistan contrary to the agreements.

The other parties to the Geneva agreements—the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan—have means to counter the unlawful interventionist actions of the Pakistani regime. And if, nevertheless, the Pakistani side does not take proper measures to stop interference from its territory in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, the Soviet Union has the right to react to that in a manner that the situation would require.

Reserve Servicemen Appeal to Pakistani President

LD2705182088 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 27 May 88

[All quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—"We are appealing to your humaneness, to your political wisdom and farsightedness, to the peaceableness of the sacred religion of Islam: Do an act of charity in the name of the future," says the appeal from the Soviet servicemen of the reserve, who performed the duty among the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan to President Ziaul Haq of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The appeal has been handed in today to Pakistan's Ambassador in the USSR Shahid Mohammad Amin.

"We," the appeal says, "were in military service among the limited contingent of the Soviet troops sent to Afghanistan at the request of that country's government for assistance to it in a time that was exceptionally

difficult for its people. We regard our service as performance of our military duty and as fraternal aid rendered to the people, with whom the Soviet people have long maintained bonds of friendship and cooperation.

In the course of the combat operations by the Afghan Army against armed opposition Soviet servicemen had to take direct part in fighting. Some of our comrades-in-arms have found themselves, because of the circumstances that did not depend on them, in captivity of the opposition force. We know that many of them were taken to camps in your country's territory.

We know that the Soviet soldiers, who were taken prisoner, are subjected to inhuman treatment and tortures. Many of them lose their lives in captivity. We cannot but be concerned about the destiny of our comrades deprived of the basic civil and human rights, torn away from their homes, their near and dear.

As a result of a long and persevering search sensible decisions were found which made the basis of the Geneva accords. Mr. President, you have also made your contribution to reaching the Geneva accords. Therefore we combat friends and comrades of those who are languishing in captivity are addressing a request to you that you use all of your possibilities, the whole of your authority and influence on Afghan opposition leaders to ensure the release of Soviet soldiers from prison.

We assure you that your efforts will be appreciated at their due worth by the near and dear of the P.O.W. soldiers, the whole Soviet people. We will cherish the hope that our plea will not be left unanswered."

POW's Held in Pakistan Subjected to Torture
LD2805090388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2013 GMT 27 May 88

[From the "View" program, presented by Vladimir Mukusev, with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent Sergey Vashurin]

[Text] [Mukusev] The withdrawal of our toops from Afghanistan continues. The papers are actively covering this important event in our life. But LITERATURNAYA GAZETA has turned this subject onto another plane rather, is that that not right, Serezha?

[Vashurin] Yes, for the first time in our Soviet national press an article by our own correspondent in the United States, Ion Ionovich Andronov, states that suddenly we have discovered that it turns out our boys are becoming prisoners in Afghanistan. They are transferred to the territory of Pakistan and they are held there in the most terrible conditions, without water or food. They are tortured and tormented. I cannot talk calmly on this subject, to be honest. They are loaded with drugs and forced, forced—attempts are made to break their will in order to force them to work against their country, to make them anti-Soviet.

[Mukusev] We have several letters from mothers who ask for help for their sons that are missing.

[Vashurin] Of course this article could not but evoke a response. We have simply had a continuous flow of responses and every letter is painful, a splash of emotions, and what is more emotions of bewilderment, incomprehension; why, why is that happening in this day and age? Why is it that 300 of our boys, our brothers, our children are in these terrible conditions and, it seems to people, nothing is being done? Everyone is asking in calls and letters; imploring LITERATURNAYA GAZETA not to cease its actions to save these boys. I can say that these actions will not cease. People are offering everything possible, people are offering money, some are even offering everything—I am already old, exchange me for this young man who is being kept in these conditions. And in connection with this I would like to say that maybe television jointly with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA could carry out some joint action to draw even greater attention to this matter.

[Mukusev] Serezha, this requires serious, serious thought and action.

[Vashurin] And action. Action is the main thing, because these people are suffering every second.

Najibullah Addresses Afghan National Assembly
LD2905103988 Moscow TASS in English 1013 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 29 TASS—The first session of the National Council (parliament) of the Republic of Afghanistan opened here today.

The joint meeting of the two chambers of parliament was addressed by President Najibullah. The creation of the National Council, he said, is one of the main accomplishments of the policy of national reconciliation. It consists of representatives of all sections of the population, including the opposition. Najibullah stressed that principles of plurality of parties and coalition formed the baiss of Afghanistan's new political system.

Touching on the problems facing the country he said that the signing of the Geneva accords opens new horizons of the policy of reconciliation and creates the necessary conditions for the speediest restoration of peace.

The president called on the members of the National Council to work out measures directed at achieving a ceasefire, returning refugees, solving pressing economic problems and further strengthening friendship with the Soviet Union. He confirmed his readiness for a positive dialogue with the opposition.

Further on Address

LD2905155188 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 29 TASS—The first session of the National Council (parliament) of the Republic of Afghanistan opened in the Afghan capital today. The members of the two houses of parliament—Volosi Jirgah and the Senate—were addressed by the Republic's President Najibullah.

"Serious changes have taken place in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres of Afghan societal life since the latest session of the top legislative body of the country", he said. "Afghanistan, upon having passed through many trials, tragic ones at times, has changed".

"The founding of the National Council is one of major achievements of the national reconciliation policy. A new constitution was adopted by the Loya Jirgah [Grand Assembly] in the course of the implementation of the policy. Elections to the National Council were held in April this year on the strength of the fundamental law of the country. Those were free, democratic and nationwide elections involving 1.6 million voters. In all, 184 deputies and 115 senators were elected. One can say with full confidence that the present national council is the most democratic and truly national body", the president pointed out.

"The National Council of the republic is the higher form of Afghan democracy which fully accords with the principles of Islam, the customs and traditions of our people".

"The wisdom of political government is that, while taking care of the common benefit, one should not to infringe the interests of various social sections and ethnic groups that make up society", Najibullah went on to say. "Due to the national reconciliation policy, the multi-party and coalition principles have been adopted as the basis for a new political system of Afghanistan".

"A coalition government", the Afghan leader pointed out, "will emerge at the helm of the state in a complex political period. The signing of the Geneva agreements opens up new horizons for the policy of reconciliation. The road to peace and security is being successfully cleared from obstructions piled up as a result of mutual distrust and lack of understanding. It is obvious that the agreements signed in Geneva do not mean an automatic establishment of peace but they create the necessary external conditions for peace to set in as soon as possible. Today we are much closer to final establishment of peace in the country. However, the remaining part of the road is still complex enough".

"As the country's president", Najibullah stated, "I am addressing the Afghan lawmakers with a proposal to work out a system of effective political, social and economic measures which will make it possible to ensure the earliest ceasefire and the return of and providing all amenities for Afghan refugees. Highly appreciating the selfless fraternal assistance by Soviet servicemen-internationalists, I am calling on the National Council to make its contribution to further strengthening friendship with the Soviet Union, the friendship bequeathed to us by our forefathers".

"Leading to Afghanistan's future is only one road—the road of peace. I will not conceal difficulties awaiting us along the way. The intransigent opposition does not wish to listen to the voice of reason and mercy, and is toughening the armed pressure. The enemy continues to rocket villages and towns and to stage acts of sabotage. We are prepared to repulse the extremists. At the same time we keep the door open for talks and for a search for compromises".

"From the positions of political realism we are prepared to listen to the opinion of the opposing side on all issues concerning the present-day and future of Afghanistan. The commencement of the work of the National Council's session is a good occasion for melting the ice of distrust and for starting a dialogue in the spirit of positive constructivism. We are prepared to receive Zahir Shah in Kabul. One would like the call for a dialogue to be also heeded by the leaders of the 'Alliance of Seven', by representatives of the moderate opposition, and by the commanders of the second and third echelons operating in Afghanistan".

"Concessions and compromises are a powerful instrument for reconciliation. Today it is passing over to the parliament. It is necessary to handle it carefully, and to be guided exclusively by national interests. Our readiness for compromises is not limitless. We shall never waive the principles of integrity, sovereignty, positive neutrality and nonalignment of Afghanistan which should remain the state friendly to its neighbours and to all peace-loving peoples", Najibullah stated.

"We shall not depart from the principles of national reconciliation", the speaker emphasized in conclusion. "Our duty is to observe the Geneva agreements which opened the way for peace. It is necessary, however, that all the signatories observe the agreements".

The president wished the members of the National Council successes in their work in implementation of the provisions of the constitution of the Afghan state.

Shevardnadze Meets With Afghanistan's Wakil

LD2705190288 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met today with member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Foreign Minister

of the Republic of Afghanistan 'Abdul Wakil. He stopped over in Moscow on the way to Havana, to a meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of the nonaligned countries.

During the meeting the ministers discussed the state of Soviet-Afghan relations and cooperation at the present stage, questions connected with the implementation of the Geneva accords, a broad range of international problems.

The confidence was expressed that the coming meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan is to become an important stage on the road toward solution of the fundamental problems of the world of today, restructuring of international relations on the basis of new political thinking, greater mutual understanding in matters related to disarmament and the solution to regional conflicts.

The ministers closely discussed the state of things with the observance by the sides of the obligations under the Geneva accords for the political settlement of the situation relating to Afghanistan. It was emphasized that the Soviet and Afghan sides honestly and conscientiously adhere to all the provisions of the Geneva documents which is shown, specifically, by the intensive withdrawal of limited contingent of Soviet troops that has been started. But Pakistan virtually does not take effective measures for the elimination from its territory of the infrastructure of interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs, even though nearly a fortnight has passed after the Geneva accords have come into effect. What is more, an increasing number of armed units of the opposition get into Afghanistan from Pakistan, the stream of armaments to Afghan insurgents via Pakistan is increasing. President of Pakistan Ziaul Haq in his recent interview spoke in an unseemly manner about Afghanistan's lawful government. His statement was essentially tantamount to an outright encouragement of the armed opposition to the continuation of bloodshed, to the continued war against the Afghan people.

'Abdul Wakil told Eduard Shevardnadze about the measures taken by the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan to advance the course at national reconciliation, at the establishment of peace in the country, restoration of Afghanistan's economy, creation of all the necessary conditions for receiving the refugees returning home. The Afghan side expressed profound gratitude to the Soviet Union for broad and versatile assistance in the development of the Afghan economy, of the social area, in the training of Afghan national cadres. The ministers noted the need to establish international interaction, also through the United Nations channels, for rendering aid to the population of Afghanistan in overcoming the consequences of the conflict and helping the returning refugees to settle down.

The sides also discussed a number of other questions of mutual interest. Touching, specifically, upon the coming meeting of the Coordinating Bureau in Havana, they expressed the confidence that the Nonaligned Movement will continue playing an important role in creating a non-nuclear and non-violent world, in improving international relations, including the settlement of regional conflicts. The meeting of ministers passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Wakil Departs Moscow

LD2705190388 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—Afghan Foreign Minister 'Abdul Wakil left Moscow for Havana today. He made a stop-over in the Soviet capital on his way from Kabul to Havana where he will attend meetings of the Non-Aligned Coordination Bureau.

Afghanistan Protests Pakistani Arms Deliveries

LD2805103188 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 28 TASS—Arms deliveries from Pakistan and their stockpiling on Afghan territory are growing from one day to the next, say two notes of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan sent Friday to a group of UN observers. The notes pointed out the need for investigating into those actions.

The attention of the UN observers was called to the fact that training centres, bases of extremist groups and arms depots belonging to them continued to exist in Pakistan. All the signatories to the Geneva accords should honestly observe them, the notes of the Afghan Foreign Ministry stated.

Ryzhkov Greets New Afghan Prime Minister

PM2905133788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 88 Second Edition p 1

[Message by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to newly appointed Afghan Prime Minister Sharq; undated]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Mohammad Hasan Sharq, prime minister of the Republic of Afghanistan

Accept sincere congratulations and best wishes on your appointment to the office of prime minister of the Republic of Afghanistan.

I am confident that your activity as head of government will help to consolidate peace and stability in Afghanistan and the further expansion of the traditional friendly relations of good-neighborliness and cooperation between our states.

I take advantage of this occasion to wish you, the Afghanistan Government, and the whole Afghan people successes in the pursuit of the policy of national reconciliation and the implementation of the broad program for the country's socioeconomic development, prosperity, and happiness.

N. Ryzhkov

BAKHTAR Comments on USSR-U.S. Summit

LD2905103788 Moscow TASS in English 0948 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Kabul May 29 TASS—Afghanistan's BAKHTAR News Agency writes that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit will be of tremendous importance for the establishment of peace in the world and open a new stage in bilateral Soviet-American relations for the good of peace in the world.

The Soviet Union's peace-loving policy directed at the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts has the ardent support of progressive mankind, of all who treasure peace on earth, the commentary says. The agreements signed in Geneva on the political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan are a marvelous example of the Soviet state's new political thinking.

Afghanistan's struggle to end the fratricidal war, the policy of national reconciliation, the Geneva accords are a result not only of the good will of the sides that signed the Geneva documents but also of the consistent efforts of the USSR and the United States. The Afghan people, BAKHTAR agency writes, hope that the Soviet Union and the United States, which are the guarantors of the political settlement around Afghanistan, will put pressure on Pakistan to make it abide by the provisions of the Geneva accords.

'Satisfaction' Toward Libya's Chad Initiative

LD3005102488 Moscow TASS in English 1010 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—The statement of Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi on his intention to settle all problems between Libya and Chad in a friendly and fraternal way, which he made at a meeting with African diplomats in Tripoli on May 26, evoked a feeling of deep satisfaction in the USSR. The Soviet people hail this gesture of good will, which testifies to positive changes in the Chadian-Libyan conflict.

A TASS diplomatic correspondent was told at the USSR Foreign Ministry that in the view of the ministry the settlement of the conflict between those two African countries was fully consistent with the interests of Libyan and Chadian peoples, all countries of the continent. The USSR hoped that the constructive step by the Libyan leadership would not be left without attention in Ndjamena. The main thing now is to strengthen and develop the nascent trend towards the political settlement of the Chadian-Libyan conflict. The Soviet Union consistently favours such a sensible approach, including contacts with countries parties to the conflict between Libya and Chad.

Al-Qadhdhafi's decision fits well into the context of improving the atmosphere in the African community and the Arab world. Within the framework of this process relations were restored in the past few months between Tunisia and Libya, Algeria and Morocco, Ethiopia and Somalia, contacts were resumed between the leadership of Syria, Libya and the PLO. All this is evidence of the growing influence of the new thinking in many regions of the world.

It is symbolical that a turn from the confrontation to the peaceful settlement between Libya and Chad took place at a time when the OAU assembly held a meeting in Addis Ababa. The normalisation of Chadian-Libyan relations in this, jubilee, year is a good present for entire Africa. The duty of the international community is to facilitate this process.

Shevardnadze To Present 7-Point Mideast Plan

JN2705120788 Manama WAKH in Arabic 1136 GMT 27 May 88

[Text] Aou Dhabi, 27 May (WAKH)—Egyptian diplomatic sources in Cairo have revealed that the USSR intends to undertake an initative to resolve the Arab-Zionist conflict. This initiative will be presented to Arab leaders during a visit that USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will pay to the region soon.

Today's issue of the Abu Dhabi-based newspaper AL-ITTIHAD cited these sources as saying the USSR initiative includes seven points. The first point stresses the need for the PLO to participate in an international conference on the condition that the PLO demonstrates its full approval of equating Palestinian rights with Israeli security.

The second point stipulates that the five permanent Security Council member states propose a specific peace formula, which takes into account the balance between the Arab right to the regain the territories and Israeli national security, along with the need to strengthen the Arab states militarily to force Israel to submit to peace.

The third point calls on the concerned parties to postpone discussing essential matters if they have differences on them and to continue discussing other issues during the convening of an international conference. The Arab party, one of whose problems may meet obstacles, can sit with the Israeli party in the presence of the permanent Security Council member states. These states will play the role of arbiter to reach an agreement.

The other points in the initiative call on the Security Council member states to guarantee the implementation of the agreements to be reached and on the United Nations to supervise their implementation.

'Specialist' on Summit, Middle East Issues

LD2805143488 Kuwait KUNA in English 1257 GMT 28 May 88

[Excerpt] Kuwait, May 28 (KUNA)—A Soviet Mideast specialist Saturday said that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev promised PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat to discuss the six-month-old Palestinian uprising with U.S. President Ronald Reagan during their summit which opens in Moscow Sunday.

In a press interview with daily "AL-QABAS", dean of the Soviet diplomatic academy Oleg Presbekyn said that Gorbachev informed 'Arafat of Moscow's stance toward the Mideast question, in regard of the convocation of an international peace conference, indicating that this issue will be under the microscope during the superpower summit.

He reiterated his country's supporting position of resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict through an international forum, saying, "we consider the international conference as a main road toward a peaceful settlement in the Middle East," emphasizing the necessity of including the five permanent members of the Security Council and parties of direct links to the problem such as Syria, Israel and the PLO in any talks. Moscow prefers an "umbrella conference" rather than an informal one, according to the Soviet expert.

On the Soviet Union's stance toward Israel, he said that his country recognizes the presence of the Zionist entity.

Speaking of the war between Iraq and Iran, raging since September 1980, the Soviet official affirmed that his country is all for the implementation of resolutions to end the hostilities, noting that Soviet Government will take advantage of Reagan's visit to Moscow to discuss the issue.

Regarding the progress of Soviet-Egyptian ties, he said that Moscow takes special interest in enhancing its relations with Cairo, indicating that such a step would benefit both peoples. [passage omitted]

West Europe

FRG Social Democratic Party Welcomes Summit

LD3005172188 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Bonn May 30 TASS—The board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany adopted a resolution at today's session welcoming the Soviet-American summit meeting which is under way in Moscow.

A press release circulated here said: "The meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, the next in turn, further enhances hopes of peoples of the world that the East-West relations will enter a new stage on which the priority will be given to the solution of political problems and possibilities of peaceful cooperation will ben analyzed."

The press release pointed out that the board of the party specially welcomed the exchange in Moscow of the documents of retification of the Soviet-American INF Treaty, which means the coming of the treaty into force. This has an encouraging effect on all those who have come out more and more actively for the termination of the crazy arms race. "Further steps are needed today for replacing the dynamics of arms buildup with the dynamics of disarmament. These include the urgent concluding of a treaty on a substantial reduction of nuclear intercontinental missiles. The Moscow summit should create conditions for reaching an agreement to this effect by the end of the current year," the press release said.

It was pointed out further that the urgent beginning of talks on disarmament in the sphere of conventional armaments was also of vital importance. The Soviet Union which is ready to agree to substantial reductions created, on its part, favourable conditions which should be reciprocated by the West in a constructive way. It is necessary as well to hold simultaneously talks on the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons and battlefield weapons. One could only welcome the fact that U.S. President Reagan spoke in favour of such actions several days ago.

Touching upon the topicality of the solution of the problem of a worldwide chemical weapons ban, the board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany expressed hope that progress in this sphere would be also achieved at the Moscow summit.

FRG Plane Reportedly Violated Soviet Airspace

AU3105100988 Paris AFP in English 0958 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Oslo, May 31 (AFP)—A small West German aircraft violated Soviet airspace twice last weekend on flights between Ivalo in Finland and Kirkenes in Norway and is thought to done so deliberately, aviation authorities said Tuesday.

The intrusions occurred exactly one year after West German amateur pilot, Mathias Rust made a spectacular landing in Moscow's Red Square after flying undetected from Finland.

Mr Rust was subsequently sentenced to four years of penal labour for his violation of Soviet airspace, and is still in a Moscow prison.

In the latest incidents, the pilot, named in reports from Helsink as Andreas Sommer of Hamburg, flew a single-engined Cessna-150, the same type of aircraft as used by Rust.

The first violation of Soviet airspace lasting only a few minutes was on Saturday as Mr Sommer was flying along the Norway-Soviet border, a spokesman for the Norwegian foreign ministry said.

The second time was on Sunday as the plane flew back to Finland.

Oslo's AFTENPOSTEN daily said Norwegian officials believed the pilot had deliberately crossed into Soviet airspace.

The intrusions occurred above the broad Pasvik Valley in which the river Pasvik clearly marks the border. Officials said the weather and visibly were good at the time and it was inconceivable the pilot had lost his way.

The intrusion coincided with the landing in Moscow Sunday of U.S. President Ronald Reagan for the fourth U.S.-Soviet summit.

Sources quoted by AFTENPOSTEN said the Soviets could probably have shot the plane down, but this might have caused grave embarrassment at the summit.

The intrusions occurred near several Soviet military installations including the world's largest naval base on the Kola peninsula.

Reports from Helsinki said Mr Sommer had been allowed to fly home after being questioned by Finnish police.

In Oslo police are investigating the incident and are preparing a report to be sent to the West German authorities, official spokesmen said.

The pilot faces possible withdrawal of his flying licence.

The Soviet commissioner in the far north has sent an official protest to Norway over the incident.

FRG's Genscher Cited on Chemical Weapons

LD3005203188 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Bonn May 30 TASS—There is a far-reaching concurrence of views between West Germany and the USSR on banning chemical weapons, said West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher to whom a reply message by Eduard Shevardnadze was handed here today. It underscores, in part, the importance of concluding an international convention on a global and total ban on chemical weapons.

According to the West German foreign ministry's report the head of the Bonn foreign policy department supported the Soviet foreign minister's proposal for conducting consultations of the two countries' experts on all aspects of the problem of banning chemical weapons. Genscher emphasized the West German Government's determination to do everything for the negotiations on a global ban on chemical weapons to be concluded even this year.

Arbatov Accuses Thatcher of 'Ignorance, Egotism'

LD2705201488 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1925 GMT 27 May 88

[By Chris Moncrieff, PRESS ASSOCIATION chief political correspondent]

[Text] A top Soviet policy-maker tonight accused Mrs Thatcher of "ignorance and egotism" in her thinking on nuclear weapons. Mr Georgiy Arabatov, director of the USA Studies Institute in Moscow, said on Channel 4 news in the run-up to the Reagan-Gorbachev summit: "I think like many ladies she changes very quickly. One day she loves Mr Gorbachev and the next day she is very angry with him. She wants to eat the cake and to leave it at the same time."

He said Mrs Thatcher was fearful of any serious changes concerning nuclear weapons.

"The whole thinking Mrs Thatcher produces on nuclear weapons is a mixture of just absolute ignorance and egotism and absolute lack of understanding of the nature of nuclear weapons," he added.

Thatcher Cited on Improved East-West Ties

PM3005145188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 May 88 Single Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "At the Center of Attention"]

[Text] London—British Prime Minister M. Thatcher, speaking here at the National Conference of Conservative Women, described the improvement in East-West relations as a "historic achievement." Although the upcoming meeting in Moscow between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan can now be described as a regular event, its significance must in now way be underestimated. Recently, the prime minister pointed out, we have traveled the difficult path from the period of cold hostility to the establishment of better East-West relations. A new spirit has prevailed in international politics, she stated, after calling upon the West to display trust in the policy of the incumbent Soviet leadership.

The head of the British Government stressed at the same time that Western countries have not abandoned their "basic principles" and have not weakened their defense. She confirmed the British Government's adherence to

nuclear weapons, stating that they are "vitally important" for Britain. According to her, the country's national security cannot be guaranteed without nuclear arms.

Danish-Norwegian TU Delegation Ends Visit

PM3105085988 Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 May 88 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit Ends"]

[Text] A visit to the USSR by delegations of the Central Federation of Danish Trade Unions and the Central Federation of Norwegian Trade Unions has ended.

In the course of their visit to Moscow and Tbilisi the guests exchanged experience of trade union work in improving working conditions and labor safety at production facilities, inspected a number of industrial enterprises, attended meetings in labor collectives, and acquainted themselves with the progress of the socioeconomic transformations which are being implemented in our country and the Soviet trade unions' participation in this effort.

The participants in a Soviet-Danish-Norwegian seminar noted the importance of exchanges of experience in the sphere of labor safety and stressed the need for the continuation of contacts of this kind which, in the general view of the delegation members, also contribute to the cause of improving mutual understanding between the peoples of our countries and to strenghening peace in the north of Europe.

Labor Safety Discussed

PM3005141588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 May 88 p 3

[Unattributed report under the rubric "International Trade Union Movement": "Discussing the Problems of Labor Protection"]

[Text] A delegation from the Danish Central Trade Union Confederation headed by Niels-Jorgen Hillstrom, secretary of the Danish confederation, and from the Norwegian Central Trade Union Confederation headed by Eydar Trulsen [name as published], chief of the Norwegian confederation's international department, are in Moscow at the invitation of the AUCCTU.

An opening ceremony was held for a Soviet-Danish-Norwegian seminar on the subject "The Development of Labor Protection Measures in the Context of Scientific and Technical Progress." During the seminar its participants will discuss questions of trade unions' activity in improving working conditions and labor protection in the period of the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the introduction of a system for administering labor protection, and will exchange experience of work in these fields.

The Danish and Norwegian trade union representatives will also visit Tbilisi, where the seminar will continue.

Briefs

Soviet-French Consultations

Moscow May 27 TASS—Soviet-French consultations on issues of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region were held at the USSR Foreign Ministry today. [Text] [*LD2805014688 Moscow TASS in English 1501 GMT 27 May 88*]

Latin America & Caribbean

Panamanian Foreign Minister on U.S. Policy

LD2805201388 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Havana May 28 TASS—The hostility of Washington's policy with regard to Panama is accounted for by the fact that the United States seeks to keep its military presence in the territory of our country after the year 2000 through a revision of the Panama Canal treaties, stated Jorge Eduardo Ritter, Panamanian minister of foreign affairs.

He arrived here to attend a special session of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement on disarmament issues. The session opens today.

Way back in 1985, he pointed out, Rear-Admiral Poindexter stated during a meeting with General Noriega, commander-in-chief of Panama's National Defence Forces, that the United States would like Panama to withdraw from the Contadora Group and, besides, provide its territory for transhipment of weapons to the Nicaraguan contras. General Noriega refused to comply with the requests, after which Poindexter came forward with overt threats. As a result, Panama is paying for the refusal to support the U.S. policy in Central America.

Criticizes Media Coverage

LD3005103988 Moscow TASS in English 1013 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Panama City May 30 TASS—TASS correspondent E. Abdullayev reports:

The government, politicians and the public of Panama are seriously concerned over Washington's attempts to aggravate Panamanian-American relations to the extreme. This has been stated in a TASS interview by Jorge Eduardo Ritter, minister of foreign affairs of Panama.

According to Jorge Eduardo Ritter, the tactics of the U.S. Administration and the mass media organs obedient to it consist in presenting the failure of its aggressive interventionist policy with regard to Panama in such a way as though it is Panama that refused to settle the conflict by

means of talks from the very beginning. Washington is trying to play the part of the aggrieved party. It seems to have forgotten completely political blackmail against Panama, pressure exerted on it, economic sanctions and a psychological war.

There should be no doubt in anybody's mind over the fact that the true objectives of the neoglobalist interventionist policy of the White House have not changed, Ritter pointed out. The United States does not give up its intention to replace the present leadership of the country with a puppet regime, to achieve the revision of the Panamanian-American treaties on the canal and primarily the lifting of the obligation to dismantle U.S. military bases in Panama. Its purpose is to preserve U.S. military presence on U.S. territory and in this way to ensure for itself a place d'armes for military-political actions aimed at suppressing national liberation movements in the region, the Panamanian foreign minister stated.

The People's Party of Panama pointed out a serious threat for the sovereignty and independence of Panama coming from U.S. intrigues which are aimed at preserving U.S. military presence in the country at all costs after the coming into force of the Panamanian-American treaties in 2000. A statement of the party circulated here said that the essence of the aggressive militaristic strategy of the United States in Latin America consisted in the toughening of control over the struggle of Latin American nations for independence and national sovereignty. However, Panama will never become an American colony. The Panamanian people are ready to repulse any aggressions and provocations of U.S. imperialism, the statement pointed out.

Cuban Foreign Minister Malmierca on Summit

LD2905105688 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Havana May 29 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Voropayev:

Cuba's Foreign Minister Isidoro Malmierca called significant the fact that the extraordinary meeting of the bureau on disarmament of the Non-Aligned Movement was happening in Havana on the eve of the Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. The Havana meeting, he told TASS, was a reflection of the striving of the non-aligned countries to translate into reality the hopes for peace, disarmament and development of all people in the world. The Cuban minister expressed the hope that the fourth Soviet-American summit meeting would also promote materialisation of those hopes.

Isidoro Malmierca expressed the conviction that the Soviet-U.S. intermediate-range nuclear forces treaty would be followed up by new treaties which would mark breakthroughs in the elimination of nuclear and chemical arms and first steps in the elimination of conventional weapons. All people in the world want this, the minister said. "We believe that the Moscow summit meeting would help achieve these noble goals."

The minister favoured adding multilateral agreements to bilateral treaties, in particular within the U.N. framework, which, he said, would meet the striving of nations to achieve a nuclear-free world and disarmament.

Sandinists Urge Further Talks With Contras

LD2805110088 Moscow TASS in English 0947 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Managua May 28 TASS—TASS correspondent Andrey Kurguzov reports:

At the current talks with the leadership of the contras on a final ceasefire, the Nicaraguan Government suggested that the meeting be extended for the purpose of achieving specific results, Manuel Espinoza, Nicaraguan minister of information, told journalists on Friday.

He said certain progress had been achieved at the meetings of the mixed working commission for the discussion of the two delegations' proposals on a peaceful settlement. At the same time contra leaders still insist that the government should meet the demands for 'democratisation' of Nicaragua before May 30, i.e., upon the expiry of the temporary ceasefire.

In this connection military reconnaissance chief Ricardo Wheelock, member of the government delegation, said at the press conference that in the event of resumption of armed actions on the part of the contras, the Sandinista People's Army would refrain from offensive operations, in accordance with the announced unilateral cessation of offensive operations, until the end of June. On the other hand, he said, the contras have never observed the truce. Over the two months that have passed since the signing of the peace agreement at Sapoa, 44 Nicaraguan people died at the hands of the contras, 85 were wounded and 286 taken hostage. The contras made 144 armed attacks on the positions of the Sandinista people's Army and laid 16 ambushes on the roads. At the same time U.S. spy planes intruded into the country's air space 35 times and made 35 provocative flights in the country's north. In the territory of Nicaragua, there are now about two thousand contras ready for attack.

Despite the attempts being made by the contras to frustrate the talks, the republic's government will press for a peaceful solution to the issue, Ricardo Wheelock emphasized.

Talks Reportedly Postponed

LD2905131988 Moscow TASS in English 0946 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Managua May 29 TASS—The Nicaraguan Government and the leaders of counter-revolutionaries have agreed to put off the last session of the current round of talks for a final ceasefire till June 7-9 in Managua.

The chieftains of the "Nicaraguan Democratic Resistance" movement refused to sign any concluding document Saturday on the results of the round, but they agreed to extend the truce till the next sitting which will be decisive for the peace settlement process in Nicaragua.

Ortega: U.S. Hinders Contra Peace Efforts

LD3105190788 Moscow TASS in English 0702 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Managua May 31 TASS—The main objective of the Nicaraguan Government and the National Leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front is to ensure lasting peace and an end to the fratricidal war, President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua said on Monday here.

The ruling circles of the United States financing and backing in every way possible the hired counter-revolutionary forces stand in the way towards ensuring peace and tranquility in Nicaragua, he said addressing a mass rally. Despite the agreement reached with the contras in Sapoa on an end to offensive operations until May 30, mercenary units have systematically violated the truce, as a result of which tens of peaceful citizens were killed. These crimes are a manifestation of terrorism by the Washington administration vis-a-vis Nicaragua, which has been elevated to the status of government policy. Nicaragua fights for just peace, against fettering agreements which the counter-revolutionaries and U.S. ruling circles wish to force on us, the Nicaraguan president stressed.

The Nicaraguan leader pointed out that at the talks with the contras some counter-revolutionary leaders displayed interest in a peaceful settlement in Nicaragua, realising that mercenary groups have suffered an utter military defeat. The government of the Republic has proposed that the temporary cessation of offensive operations be prolonged by one month to prevent new bloodshed, yet the line of rabid anti-Sandinistas led by Enrique Bermudes has prevailed among the contra leadership. The former Somozista colonel was sent by Washington specially to prevent the tendencies of peaceful settlement and frustrate the talks on the eve of the summit meeting in Moscow which is to discuss both global problems and those of the regional conflicts. Despite the administration's attempts at protracting the peace talks, the Sandinista Government of Nicaragua will make every effort for a peaceful settlement of the question and for putting an end to the war in the country, Daniel Ortega noted.

Mexican Socialist Delegation Visits Moscow

PM2505095588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Familiarization With CPSU's Experience"]

[Text] At the CPSU Central Committee's invitation, a Mexican Socialist Party [PSM] delegation headed by parliamentary Deputy E. Valle, member of the National Executive Committee and of the Secretariat of the PSM National Council, is visiting the USSR to familiarize itself with the course of restructuring and the preparations for the 19th all-union party conference.

In Moscow the guests held conversations at the CPSU Central Committee International Department and the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Institute and visited the editorial office of the journal KOMMUNIST. In Leningrad, they familiarized themselves with the work of the party gorkom and met with the leadership of the local television service. In Estonia, the Mexican comrades were received at the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee and at the republic's Supreme Soviet, visited Tartu State University, the Tallinn plywood furniture combine, and the editorial office of the newspaper RAKHVA KHYAYAL. They also held a meeting with representatives of the creative intelligentsia.

The PSM representatives remarked that they were greatly impressed by the increasingly active involvement of representatives of all strata of Soviet society in the processes of revolutionary transformations conducted by the CPSU and emphasized the great international significance of the renewal of socialism in the USSR and its positive influence on the world revolutionary movement.

Political & Social

Yeltsin Calls for Ouster of Ligachev

LD3005224588 London BBC Television Network in English 2140 GMT 30 May 88

["World Exclusive" interview with Boris Yeltsin, first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Civil Construction and Architecture, by BBC correspondent Peter Snow at the Construction Ministry in Moscow; date not given—recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] [Yeltsin] I'm emotional. I take everything that happens very much to heart, especially anything that doesn't work out. I'm always 95 percent dissatisfied with my own work and only 5 percent satisfied. [video shows meeting with Gorbachev and Yeltsin on presidium; Yeltsin meeting people on streets]

[Snow] From the day Gorbachev took power Yeltsin was at his shoulder, summoned from his base at Sverdlovsk in the Urals. His compelling dynamism and the popularity he won with his enthusiasm for meeting people and their needs made him Gorbachev's natural choice as Moscow party chief. Yeltsin fired two thirds of the Moscow party bosses. And he made it clear that he was determined to transform public attitudes at the Communist Party. He said he'd slash privileges and perks like chauffeur-driven cars and the shops like this one in (Gramovskiy) street in Moscow where senior party members only are able to stock up with supplies not generally available to the public.

[Yeltsin] The privileges which a certain section of the leadership do indeed have can't help the morale of everyone else. On the contrary, people are unhappy about them. Therefore I always argued that if there was a shortage of anything in our society—and that is the case—then every member of society should experience that shortage to an equal degree.

[Snow] At the Grand Kremlin Palace on 21 October last year there was a now famous meeting of the 300-odd members of the Central Committee. By this time Boris Yeltsin was a candidate member of the ruling Politburo at the peak of his power. He made a speech vigorously attacking those who were slowing the pace of reform. Until today it has not been known for sure whether he attacked Mr Ligachev, Mr Gorbachev's number two in person. Mr Ligachev has been seen up to now, but not openly named, as the man who wants to put a brake on the pace of reform.

Andrey Gromyko, too, the impassive 78-year old former foreign minister, now Soviet president, who met President Reagan at the airport on Sunday, was reported to have been attacked by Yeltsin at that meeting. [video shows Gromyko and Reagan; Mrs Gorbacheva at meeting] And some said that even Raisa, Mikhail Gorbachev's wife, came in for some criticism for starting a personality cult.

[Yeltsin] I criticized the leadership and especially Comrade Ligachev, because so far the process of change in the party is going slowly. The party is lagging behind. The process of democratization in the party is not developing. The style and methods of work in the party are lagging behind the processes of perestroyka which are going on elsewhere. And all these matters are, in the first instance, his responsibility. He is one of the main opponents on questions of social justice.

[Snow] In view of what you say about Mr Ligachev, do you think it right for Mr Ligachev to stay where he is, if the radical reforms which you want are to proceed?

[Yeltsin] Of course, it would be possible to carry out the process of change more energetically if there was another man in his place.

[Snow] Let me be quite blunt with you. Would you like to see Mr Ligachev removed from his position, removed from the center of power because he is, in your judgment, opposed to reform?

[Yeltsin] Yes.

[Snow] Do you think there should be open public discussion about the difference among the leaders? Do you think, for example, that it is unfortunate that Mikhail Gorbachev himself has not expressed openly his concerns about Mr Ligachev?

[Yeltsin] It's hard for me to say what his attitude to Comrade Ligachev is. But I consider that Ligachev's style of work, some of it, particularly his authoritarian style that we're now critizing everyone for, is, coming from a party leader, is basically unacceptable.

[Snow] What about President Gromyko? Were you critical of him at that meeting?

[Yeltsin] No. I was saying that some renewal is needed in the ranks of the Politburo for perestroyka to proceed more energetically.

[Snow] There are reports that at that meeting on October 21 you were critical of Raisa Gorbacheva. Do you think the way that she conducts herself is wholly in line with the way you think the first lady should behave?

[Yeltsin] I think it would not be entirely ethical to answer that question.

[Snow] Looking back at that meeting now, with 9 months' hindsight, do you think you did go over the top? Do you think you did actually express yourself too forcefully?

[Yeltsin] Perhaps I made some mistakes. But in general the mistakes were not in the content of my speech but in the timing of it. It was immediately before the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. And at that moment to come out with such a critical speech, particularly criticizing the leaders and perestroyka and so on—that was not good timing. That was my mistake.

[Snow] What Yeltsin said and did was too much for most of his colleagues. By the end of October, 7 months ago, key party leaders had decided Yeltsin had to go. The strain took its toll of Yeltsin. He was rushed to hospital with heart trouble. And while still under medical treatment he was summoned to a meeting at the Moscow headquarters, at which he was attacked on a broad front. He was relieved of his post and asked to confess his mistakes. He was reported at the time as having admitted that he was guilty.

[Yeltsin] The people who spoke were, in effect, selected. You see, they were all people whose toes I'd stepped on. I would say that there were no concrete accusations against me. It was, in my view, abstract accusations, even demagogic. He is ultra-reformist, takes ultra-radical decisions, and so on. In short I was accused of being an ultra-leftist, which I'm not. I'm simply in favor of energetic action for perestroyka, energetic, fast and effective action which would bring results. And so far the results are very, very insignificant.

[Snow] Once you knew that you were no longer the Moscow party boss, how did you feel about that? Were you very upset by that?

[Yeltsin] I have never felt like that before, although I've had plenty of ups and downs in life. But that time I was knocked out. And although they did not manage to count me out—I didn't become a political corpse—all the same, my condition is serious, and less in a physical sense then in a psychological one. I'm used to people from the Urals. There people wouldn't have acted like that.

[Snow] Do you think it was fair that you were sacked at the meeting?

[Yeltsin] A month and a half before this I gave in a notice of resignation, because questions had arisen in my relations with the person I'd already told you about.

[Snow] Mr Ligachev?

[Yeltsin] Of course.

[Snow] What about Mr Gorbachev's role in your story? Are you disappointed that he hasn't said more in your defense?

[Yeltsin] I'm upset. He could have acted more decisively in renewing the leadership, the top rung. And that would have speeded up the process of perestroyka.

[Snow] Last week Boris Yeltsin was formally voted off the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet because he'd taken on a government post in the construction ministry. And an interview with him appeared in the German edition of MOSCOW NEWS this month, in which he restated his views that the Soviet Union urgently needed to keep up the momentum of reform.

[Yeltsin] In the first period of perestroyka there was an excessive euphoria about how quickly change would come. But 3 years have passed, and there have been no basic changes. And that worries the Central Committee, the Politburo, and, of course, Comrade Gorbachev. And, most importantly, we've got to solve the problems of food supply, consumer goods, and the provision of consumer services. All efforts are now concentrated on that. Without doubt, if there haven't been any basic changes in another 3 years, then people's faith in perestroyka will decline.

[Snow] How would you describe your own role and your own future? Do you think there is a chance that you might return to the top leadership?

[Yeltsin] There is a boundless ocean of work to be done here. Here too, one can show what one is capable of in the course of perestroyka and not have to think about returning to where one was before. But, of course, from the political point of view I'm a bit pushed aside from active politics. And I'm not entirely satisfied with the job I've got now.

Arbatov: Yeltsin 'Did Not Act Correctly'

AU3105130488 Paris AFP in English 1257 GMT 31 May 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, May 31 (AFP)—Former Moscow party chief Boris Yeltsin "did not act correctly" by calling for the ouster of the Communist party's number two, Yegor Ligachev, a Soviet official said here Tuesday. Georgi Arbatov, head of the Soviet Institute for the United States and Canada, said in a press conference that Mr. Yeltsin's interview to the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) Monday in which he made the remark was due to "the effect of emotion." He refused to elaborate. [passage omitted]

Further on Armenia, Azerbaijan Unrest

Meeting Urges Normalization

NC2705114988 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 28 May 88

[From the review of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN]

[Text] A meeting was held at Yerevan Theater Square at the end of the working day on 25 May. The participants in the meeting expressed support for the (?process) of reconstruction, democratization, and [words indistinct] in all aspects of life.

Recalling the incidents created around Nagorno-Karabakh, they proposed that measures be taken in the region to return the situation to normal. The [word indistinct] (?were called on) to display self-restraint and not to display sentiments, and to inform the new leadership of the republic—with their [word indistinct] works—about the accumulated socioeconomic, ecological, and (?other) problems and (?the need) to find a solution to them. The participants in the meeting supported these calls. [word indistinct] and (?soviet) workers gave some explanations on the issues that were raised [words indistinct].

The newspaper cites an ARMENPRESS report on the meeting held at the capital's Theater Square.

Demonstrations in Yerevan

AU2905085588 Paris AFP in English 0816 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 29 (AFP)—More than 50,000 people demonstrated in Yerevan, capital of Soviet Armenia Saturday, on the 70th anniversary of the short-lived republic, to demand the release of nationalist militant Paruir Airikyan, dissident sources said here. The two-hour-long demonstration also called for official recognition of May 28 as Armenia's "Independence Day," sources said.

Several speakers addressed the crowd at a rally in the city centre, according to Movses Gordisyan, an Armenian militant interviewed by telephone. He said he had read to the crowd a telegram sent to the supreme soviets of the USSR and of Armenia calling for "May 28 to be officially declared Armenia's Independence Day." The telegram also urged authorities to "rapidly release" Mr Airikyan, who has been detained since March 24 on charges of "spreading false reports and anti-Soviet slander." He was arrested after giving foreign journalists details on recent ethnic disturbances in Armenia and Azerbaijan. His wife, Yelena Airikyan, is among Soviet dissidents invited to meet U.S. President Ronald Reagan Monday in Moscow.

Mr Gordisyan said about 200 Armenian students had been occupying the square in front of Yerevan Opera House for four days to force the authorities to keep Armenian territorial demands "under review." Armenians want their border with Azerbaijan redrawn to reincorporate Nagorno-Karabakh, a region ceded to Azerbaijan in 1923 by Joseph Stalin.

New First Secretaries Meet

LD2905152488 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—The first secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Azerbaijan and Armenia, Abdula-Rahman Vezirov and Suren Arutyunyan, met today.

They visited districts in the two republics and examined the issues of stepping up economic and cultural relations and educating working people in a spirit of internationalism.

More Protests Noted

AU3105100488 AFP in English 0927 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 31 (AFP)—Hundreds of thousands of Armenians demonstrated in central Yerevan, capital of Soviet Armenia, late Monday to demand a solution to the problem of the disputed Armenian enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh, in Azerbaijan, an Armenian nationalist said Tuesday.

Police arrested 12 demonstrators, who were later sentenced to jail terms of five to 10 days, during the five-hour-long demonstration on Yerevan's Opera Square, Armenian nationalist Movses Gordissyan said. He added that about 1,000 students were continuing a six-day-old sit-in on Opera Square in support of Armenian demands that Nagorno-Karabakh, whose population is 75 per cent Armenian, be reincorporated into the Armenian republic.

"Feelings are running high" in Armenia, Mr. Gordissyan said. He added that the demonstrators called on the Communist Party's Central Committee to look into the Nagorno-Karabakh issue on an urgent basis and find "concrete responses" to Armenian demands.

Meanwhile, the Armenian Communist Party daily KOMMUNIST on Tuesday published a report about last Saturday's Armenian demonstration at Yerevan, in which more than 50,000 people were reported by dissident sources to have taken part. "A few people, hiding behind Nagorno-Karabakh slogans, attempted to defend (Armenian nationalist militant) Paruir Airikyan, known for his anti-Soviet statements," the paper said. The demonstrators "tried to incite people to committing unlawful deeds, but these attempts were condemned by those present," the paper added. It did not specify how many people had taken part in the demonstration.

Mr. Gordissyan said that more than 50,000 people demonstrated Saturday to demand Mr. Airikyan's release and to call for May 28 to be officially declared Armenia's Independence Day. Mr. Airikyan was arrested on March 24 and charged with "spreading false rumors and anti-Soviet calumnies."

Azerbaijan Plenum Fires Officials

LD3105115788 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Baku May 31 TASS—A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Soviet Azerbaijan came to a close here today. The plenum elected deputies to the 19th all-union party conference to open late in June.

The plenum dismissed from the party Boris Kevorkov, former first secretary of the Nagorno-Karabakh Regional Committee of the CPSU, for serious political mistakes in guiding the regional party organisation.

His errors resulted in the loss of the party organisation's vanguard role and in the heightening of inter-ethnic relations. He was found to be personally responsible for the disorders that took place in the autonomous region.

The plenum dismissed from the CPSU D.M. Muslim-Zade, former first secretary of the Sumgait City Committee of the party, for major shortcomings in organisational and political work that brought about the tragic developments in Sumgait.

Tatar Tent Village Surrounded by Troops

AU3005104488 Paris AFP in English 1025 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 30 (AFP)—A Crimean Tatar tent village set up to back demands for a return of Tatars to their traditional homeland has been surrounded by Soviet security forces, a Tartar spokeswoman told AFP here Monday. Several hundred Crimean Tatars have been living in some 500 tents near Zuya, in central Crimea, for the past four days. More than 1,000 soldiers drafted in from the Ukraine and nearly as many militiamen have surrounded the camp and on Sunday stopped food being sent in, the group's spokeswoman, Elvira Ablayeva, added.

The Tatars are demanding the right to settle legally in the Crimea. Some 400,000 Tatars were deported from there to central Asia by Stalin in 1944 after being accused of collaborating with occupying Nazi troops.

One of those taking part in the protest, Abderashid Jebarov, was on Sunday charged with "aggravated hooliganism," Mrs Ablayeva said. Since mid-May, Soviet authorities have been stopping Tatars entering the Crimea, she added.

According to Soviet press reports, some 17,500 Tatars are currently living "illegally" in the Crimea. Since last January, 4,183 Tatars have been granted permits to settle in the Crimea. The Crimea is under Ukranian administration. The Ukranian authorities have said that it does not need an influx of Tatar settlers.

Police Break Up Leningrad Demonstration

AU2905102888 Paris AFP in English 0945 GMT 29 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 29 (AFP)—Some 2,000 supporters of the unofficial Soviet independent opposition party Democratic Union, staged a two-hour demonstration late Saturday in central Leningrad before being dispersed by police using water cannons, dissident sources said Sunday. The demonstrators, who massed Saturday evening outside Kazan Cathedral in Leningrad, called for "a multi-party system" in the Soviet Union, according to Yevgenia Debrianskaya, a member of the Democratic Union leadership. Police broke up the demonstration and arrested 35 people who were later released after questioning. Two leaders of unofficial "clubs", Sergei Semionov and Valeri Bajenov, were badly hurt in the clash, she said.

The demonstration came on the eve of the arrival in Moscow of President Ronald Reagan for his fourth summit with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Police Break Up Tbilisi Demonstration

AU2705073088 Paris AFP in English 2327 GMT 26 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 27 (AFP)—Soviet police broke up a demonstration by around 100 Georgian nationalists in Tbilisi, the capital of the Soviet republic of Georgia, on Thursday, a Georgian dissident said. The demonstrators were commemorating the 70th anniversary of the declaration of the independent Georgian Social Democratic Republic, which survived until February 25, 1921, when Soviet troops invaded and proclaimed the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Heavy police contingents had been deployed in anticipation of trouble, and as soon as the demonstrators unfurled banners saying "Long Live Independence Day" the police moved in, the dissident Zviad Gamsakhourdia said. Many of the protesters were hauled in for questioning before being released in the evening, he said. Taking part in an unofficial protest carries a maximum three year jail sentence in Georgia.

On Wednesday an official daily called on its readers to commemorate May 26 as the day when Georgia won independence thanks to the October Revolution in St. Petersburg. It failed to say that Georgia's independence was proclaimed by the Mensheviks, not by the Bolsheviks who predominated in the Soviet Union.

Dissidents Air Complaints to Western Media

PM3105074988 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 24 May 88 p 18

[Ingrid Olausson report on undated Moscow news conference by unnamed Soviet dissidents: "Crowded 'Dissident Meeting'"—editorial note identifies Olausson as a member of a Swedish "Citizens Diplomacy" group which recently visited the Soviet Union]

[Text] A number of us from the group went to the "dissident meeting." Not until the day before the meeting were we told the address. It had to be kept secret until the last minute, in order not to run the risk of harassment. We arrived at a down-at-heel residential area in a Moscow suburb. There was a handwritten note on one of the street doors, so we knew that we had come to the right place.

The little apartment was packed with people. In the hall people were standing so close to each other that it was almost impossible to get in. We were four foreign guests and we were put in one corner of a small room with an interpreter. There were microphones in the lounge, packed with chairs on which an expectant audience sat, and there were loudspeakers in every room, so that everyone would be able to hear.

Everyone was silent when the conference began.

"We have to stop the ideological war," Timofeyev began. "Our aim here is to help to achieve a common language for East and West."

The first speaker raised the major problem of unemployment. "In the United States there are statistics—we have no comparable statistics here," he said. He listed figures, many of them produced to fill the gaps in the inadequate official statistics. According to the speaker, unemployment in the Soviet Union exceeds that in the United States.

"We have feudal laws here; people cannot move to where they want to live and many cannot get a job that is commensurate with their education.

"Some 50 percent of our population are living under subsistence level and are considered poor. If we were to use the U.S. yardstick to assess who is poor, 80 percent would end up under that level."

The next speaker talked about the large group of people—the most seriously affected—who have neither identity document, home, nor job. If you have no document, you cannot get anywhere to live or a job. Many people manage nevertheless with temporary, illegal jobs.

"I myself have traveled a lot in our country and seen an awful lot with my own eyes. Every city has a camp where such people can live."

The speaker says that official statistics count only those who live in such camps—this gives 700,000 homeless. But he thought that a more correct figure is 1.2 million. According to the law, all these people can be punished. But it seems increasingly that people are turning a blind eye.

"We ought to be able to afford to help them," he said. "They ought at least to be given food and clothing. As things are now, they do not get even the most basic medical care."

A hum of comment on the speeches began, and people were talking to each other in the hall and the kitchen, where the loudspeakers did not reach. Suddenly a film team arrived and started filming both speakers and audience without anyone even batting an eyelid or protesting. I saw that the camera had NBC written on the side and was later told that they were filming a report for a pre-summit U.S. television program.

"There are so many who are deprived of their absolutely fundamental human rights," the next speaker said. "Every person should share the accumulated goods which humanity has laid up. We have an absolutely stagnant economic system and we simply have to content ourselves with what surplus there is. We will have no real progress as long as we continue to have the present economic and social structure."

Gorkiy Street Demonstration Described

PM3105105488 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Yuriy Makarov report: "Conversation With a Militiaman About Politics"]

[Text] Groups of young people with banners began to assemble in the very center of the capital, in Gorkiy Street, at about 1600 hours on Saturday.

We have already begun to grow used to the fact that demonstrations do not necessarily involve many thousands of people or happen exclusively on "red-letter days." Even those who do not at all like someone else's opinion are gradually learning to receive it calmly, without resorting to the argument of force. Especially since the majority in our society are, I think, in solidarity with many of the slogans at this particular demonstration by young people.

What do the slogans concern? Restructuring, the democratization of elections, the struggle against conservativeness, the strengthening of citizens' constitutional rights. Such as: "Glasnost—yes! Bureaucracy—no!" "Not the people for socialism, but socialism for the people," "Down with bureaucrats in the organs of power!" Slogans which on the whole reflect the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference. There were others too, but that is not what we are talking about.

Having expressed their opinions again and again, the initiators of the demonstration sounded the "retreat" after exactly an hour, and dispersed peacefully. This time, the ethics of democracy were displayed by both the demonstrators and the militiamen who went about their business: the observance of order, and nothing more.

But the organizers of the demonstration dispersed, rolling up their banners, while the debate was, it turned out, only just beginning. New people arrived, stopped, joined in the discussion. A few spontaneous groups formed. And in the center of each group was...a militiaman. They, the young militiamen, were being asked tricky

questions. Various proposals of a political nature were put to them. They were asked to give authoritative assessments of the most topical problems of our turbulent public life.

Some of the guys in uniform, bowing their heads, asked the citizens, with firm politeness, to disperse. Others took on the role of ideologists.

But what else could they do? Not one of our staff and nonstaff agitators, propagandists, lecturers, or other workers in political enlightenment or from party raykoms or the Komsomol was present in Gorkiy Street at that time. Just as they are virtually never present in other streets, in other cities or villages, where people are saying aloud what they think and wanting to hear another opinion.

At the moment, it is only with a militiaman that you can discuss politics in the street. He has to be, willy-nilly, an ideologist, and a propagandist, and a lecturer. But the real ideologists, propagandists, and lecturers are obviously chatting with each other in their offices at the time. And that is how we learn democracy.

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session

25 May Proceedings Noted

PM3105105988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 88 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed "Information Report on Sittings of USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The 9th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, continued its work in Moscow 25 May 1988.

The first session of the Soviet of Nationalities was held at 1000 hours in the Hall of Sessions. A.E. Voss, chairman of the chamber, presided.

Those present stood in honor of the memory of Deputies Yu.D. Ubilava and D. Yusupov, deceased.

The Soviet of Nationalities heard a report by G.M. Grinevaya, secretary of the Credentials Commission, regarding confirmation of the authority of deputies elected to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities for 11 electoral okrugs to replace outgoing deputies. The Soviet of Nationalities resolved to acknowledge the authority of Deputies S.M. Katlevskiy, V.I. Shimko, T.A. Zhumakanov, V.A. Ryabokom, A.D. Budyki, T. Mirkhalikov, G.Kh. Shakhnazarov, A.N. Volkov, V.M. Kolinkov, M.I. Sorokin, and S. Veknazarov.

Deputy G.G. Bartoshevich has been relieved of his duties as chairman of the Consumer Goods and Trade Commission in connection with his transfer to other work, and Deputy Z.K. Kamalidenov has been relieved of his duties as chairman of the Health and Social Security Commission in connection with his election as deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The Soviet of Nationalities elected Deputy A.S. Kamay as chairman of the Consumer Goods and Trade Commission and Deputy E. Zhakselekov as chairman of the Health and Social Security Commission.

Other changes were made to the composition of permanent commissions.

The Soviet of Nationalities then moved on to discuss the USSR draft Law on the Cooperative System in the USSR.

Deputies G.S. Tarazevich, G.I. Shegeda, I.I. Gladkiy, G.M. Voskanyan, P.K. Luchinskiy, N.I. Pisaar, V.V. Sakalauskas, S. Kazatova, Kh.T. Veldi, E.Yu. Salayev, and I.A. Demchenko took part in the debates.

With this the Soviet of Nationalities finished discussing the second question on the session's agenda.

In connection with the fact that a number of comments and proposals were voiced in the course of the discussion by Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities deputies of the draft Law on the Cooperative System in the USSR, the chambers tasked the Agro-Industrial Complex Commissions and the Legislative Proposals Commissions with examining the proposals submitted along with USSR Government representatives and report on the results to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The second joint sitting of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities was held in the Great Kremlin Palace at 1500 hours. Yu.N. Khristoradnov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, presided.

The USSR Supreme Soviet embarked on the examination of the next question on the session's agenda. Deputy Yu.P. Batalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR Gosstroy chairman, delivered a report on the work of soviet and economic organs to fulfill the program for housing and cultural and consumer service construction in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

V.A. Zgurskiy, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Communal Housing and Municipal Economy Commission, delivered the coreport of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' permanent commissions on this question.

The session is continuing its work.

Housing Program Discussed 26 May

LD2605094888 Moscow TASS in English 0925 GMT 26 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 26 TASS—Addressing today the session of the Soviet parliament which is discussing the course of implementation of the country's housing programme, Oleg Lobov, vice-chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, noted that the rate of housing construction in the Russian Federation increased in 1986-1987, eleven million square metres of housing (nearly 220 thousand apartments) were built over and above plan. Oleg Lobov listed among the factors hampering speedy housing construction the rest of the budget principle of appropriations on the social programmes, which is still in effect, the excessive number of instructions regulating even the most insignificant aspects of construction.

Addressing the session, Nikolay Zlobin, leader of the construction team in Moscow, said that "cost accounting introduced since January this year has become a good incentive for improving the performance of the construction organizations. It placed the earnings of every worker in direct dependence on the effectiveness of his work. As a result a 12 per cent increase in labour productivity has been ensured.

Vitaliy Masol, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukraine, said that over the past two years several million square metres of housing had been built and made available in the republic, a third of that having been put up by individual builders. In that connection he offered that the construction of detached cottages be allowed even to those who have municipal apartments. Moving into their own houses such people would vacate apartments for those who so far live in conditions that are relatively worse.

The debate has shown that the destiny of the housing programme depends in a large measure on the initiative of the local bodies of power. The housing problem is resolved much faster where they prove to be able to tap additional reserves for funding construction rather than pin hopes solely on capital investments by the states.

The parliament is to wind up the debate on the course of implementation of the housing problem today.

Resolution on Supreme Court

PM3005110388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 88 Morning Edition p 1

[USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution "On Report on the Activity of the USSR Supreme Court"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet notes that the USSR Supreme Court, in fulfilling the functions imposed on it by the law as the supreme legal organ of the Soviet state, is structuring its work in accordance with CPSU decisions on the all-around consolidation of socialist legality and law and order as a necessary condition for restructuring all aspects of the life of society.

The USSR Supreme Court is taking steps to further improve justice in the country with a view to reliably defending Soviet citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms, ensuring the legality and substantiation of court decisions, sentences, rulings, and decrees on civil and criminal cases, enhancing the effectiveness of the courts' work in the struggle against crimes and other law violations, and educating all citizens in a spirit of unconditional observance of the laws.

In the period under review the USSR Supreme Court has activated work to study and generalize legal practice and has sent the courts a number of fundamentally important guideline explanations on questions of the correct application of legislation and the timely and legal solution of court cases on the basis of the strict observance of the democratic principles of jurisprudence and in the interests of legal backup for restructuring.

Special attention has been paid to the defense of Soviet citizens' honor and dignity, rights and freedoms, and the protection of their property. There has been a regular examination of the execution of labor, housing, and nature conservation legislation, the safekeeping of socialist property, and the struggle against bribery, speculation, drunkenness, and drug addiction.

The USSR Supreme Court has consistently oriented the courts toward the need for a more differentiated and fairer approach to imposing a legal penalty, which has promoted a marked reduction in incarceration for people who have committed crimes which present no great public danger and whose reeducation is possible without isolation from society.

The USSR's supreme legal organ has examined more frequently in the court of original jurisdiction cases of exceptional importance of fundamental significance for legal practice. Supervisory activity has been stepped up over the courts' work in carrying out justice and there has been an increase in exactingness regarding the fullness and objectivity of the study of all circumstances during a legal investigation and ensuring procedural laws in resolving specific cases. The USSR Supreme Court has begun to do more checking in the procedure of supervising appeals and cases and to rescind illegal and unjustified legal decisions, including decisions regarding people repressed in the thirties and the postwar period.

At the same time the USSR Supreme Soviet believes that the USSR Supreme Court is still making insufficient use of its powers for resolutely eradicating the errors and law violations encountered in the courts' work, of instances

of an uncritical attitude toward materials collected during the preliminary investigation, and of lack of objectivity and indifference toward the fate of people committed partly because of the courts' poor liaison with the labor collectives and the population.

The USSR Supreme Court has not always ensured the in-depth study and generalization of legal practice for elaborating prompt and qualified guideline explanations from the USSR Supreme Court Plenum on the most topical questions connected with implementing economic reform, introducing scientific and technical achievements, developing cooperative and individual labor activity, application of laws affecting national relations, and other problems facing the courts under the conditions of restructuring, glasnost, and the democratization of the life of Soviet society.

The results of the generalization of legal practice and the activity of the union republic supreme courts, whose chairmen are ex officio members of the USSR Supreme Court, are insufficiently used for the USSR Supreme Court's implementation of the right of legislative initiative and raising questions of the interpretation of existing laws.

The USSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. That the USSR Supreme Court, guided by the requirements of the USSR Constitution and the instructions of the 27th CPSU Congress on the protection of Soviet citizens' rights and legal injuries and the consolidation of legality and law and order in the country:

Take additional steps to enhance the standard of legal activity, focusing attention on resolutely eliminating the errors committed by the courts, on implementing the democratic principles of Soviet justice, and on ensuring the strict observance of Soviet laws in examining and resolving specific cases;

Enhance in every way the courts' role in defending citizens' political, labor, housing, and other socioeconomic and personal rights and freedoms, in ensuring the safekeeping of state and public property and the interests of enterprises, and in stepping up the struggle against thriftlessness;

Undertake a profound study and generalization of legal practice, and give the courts prompt guidelines on the most complex and topical questions of the use of legislation under the conditions of the further democratization of the life of society, the implementation of economic reform, and the implementation of the USSR Law "On the Procedure for Appealing to the Court Against Illegal Actions by Officials Encroaching on Citizens' Rights." Improve the quality of guideline explanations, enlist scientists and practical workers more extensively to the preparation of these acts, and seek greater effectiveness in monitoring their fulfillment;

Improve supervision of the activity of the USSR and union republic courts, ensure the attentive and prompt examination of appeals on legal cases, and react in a keen and principled manner to violations of legality and instances of imposing unjustified decisions and sentences and the illegal institution of criminal proceedings;

Demand from the courts a more painstaking study of the reasons and conditions giving rise to crimes and other law violations and the adoption of the measures envisaged by the law to eliminate them;

Seek to enhance the educational role of court trials and to expand the courts' ties with the labor collectives and the public.

2. That the USSR Supreme Court, USSR Prosecutor's Office, USSR Ministry of Justice, and USSR MVD must improve their collaboration in studying the state of crime and the crime rate [sudimost] with a view to revealing and resolutely overcoming negative trends.

3. That the union and autonomous republic supreme courts must give every assistance to increasing the authority and consolidating the independence of courts, enhance the court's role as an elected organ, regularly hear at their sessions reports from the relevant courts, and consolidate the ties of the courts and people's legislators with the labor collective.

4. That the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities legislative proposals commissions be instructed to examine critical comments and proposals on questions of improving legislation voiced by deputies during the discussion of the report on the USSR Supreme Court's activity and where necessary make the relevant proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium,

T. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium,

Moscow, Kremlin, 26 May 1988.

Gromyko Addresses Award Ceremony

PM2605160188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Presentation of Awards"]

[Text] On 25 May in the Kremlin, A.A. Gromyko presented orders to a group of comrades on whom these high motherland awards have been conferred for their services to the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

The following were awarded the Order of Lenin: L.A. Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.G. Dikusarov, first secretary of the Khmelnitskiy party obkom; V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow party obkom; Ya.P. Pogrebnyak, first secretary of the Lvov party obkom; N.Ye. Kruchina, CPSU Central Committee administrator of affairs; V.D. Kryuchkov, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; and F.A. Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The following were awarded the Order of the October Revolution: I.V. Koksanov, USSR minister of the shipbuilding industry; and V.I. Shimko, USSR minister of the radio industry. The following were awarded the Order of Friendship of the Peoples: M.M. Aripdzhanov, first secretary of the Andizhan Uzbek Communist Party Obkom; and P.G. Gilashvili, chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The recipients of the awards warmly thanked the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government for this high appraisal of their work.

Addressing the recipients of the awards, A.A. Gromyko stated:

Esteemed Comrades!

Today you party and soviet workers have received high state awards: orders of our motherland.

Each of you said a few words on receiving your award, words which conveyed a great deal.

The conferring of orders on people such as you who are actively involved in affairs of restructuring—you all mentioned this—not only signifies a summing up of the results of the ground you have covered in your life and work. It not only shows that you work conscientiously, thereby justifying the people's faith. Today awards like these are also a kind of advance: This has also been rightly mentioned by some comrades here. An award like this is also an indication that the party and the state believe in you, rely on you, and value you.

The very recent CPSU Central Committee plenum and the USSR Supreme Soviet session now in progress give us new strength, focus our sights on the next tasks in restructuring all spheres of state and social life, and bring us closer to the most important event of the present stage, the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. I would like to draw your attention to the theses for the upcoming conference and to the vivid speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the plenum.

You are all forward-looking in your own way in your territories or sectors. People are drawn to you, as leaders and Communists. This is natural, as you well know. As leaders of the masses, you must reciprocate.

Your work, every one of your actions, and every speech you make must tally with the party course. At the same time, the Central Committee urges you to show initiative and daring for the sake of grandiose transformations. I would particularly like to emphasize the word "daring."

If your initiative is aimed at improving the life of the people's masses and if it helps you to solve the vital issues facing society, then this is exactly what is required of you. It will mean that you are keeping pace with restructuring. We have reached an exceptionally crucial, extremely important stage in the life of the party and the country.

I would like to take the opportunity to tell you that no foreign delegation or foreign visitor to the Soviet Union fails to show an interest and ask: "And how are things going in Moscow with restructuring? Is it working or not?" Some ask this question with a certain degree of skepticism—it is not hard to see. But the degree of their skepticism is steadily shrinking.

Recently, even abroad, the opinion is strengthening that our party and the Soviet people are tackling things seriously and look to the future with confidence. Just a few days ago, I had occasion to receive a large delegation of foreign public figures in this hall. Among them was former U.S. Secretary of State Rogers, who still plays an important role in his country. I asked him: "Could you please tell me what the present mood of public opinion is in the United States? Do Americans believe that we will solve the tasks we have set ourselves? But most important of all, do they think that the success of restructuring will be useful to our relations with the United States and the world as a whole, or not?"

He replied: "Some 95 percent of Americans not only believe, they also think that restructuring will be useful for the international climate as a whole and for Soviet-American relations, in particular."

This was said by a man who has been in the crucible of international politics for many years and knows what is what.

A similar comment was made by the Japanese representative Fukuda, a big businessman who was once Japanese foreign minister and prime minister. I did not ask him what I asked Rogers, but he mentioned this on his own initiative. He said that the overwhelming majority of Japanese people feel the same way.

We have achieved something: People all over the world have begun to believe in us, millions and millions of people. This is also a sign that we are on the right road.

I congratulate you on receiving these high awards from the motherland. I do this on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government. I also congratulate you on behalf of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

I wish you more great success in your work. I hope this day will be one of celebration in your families and among your friends and relatives!

A.A. Gromyko's speech was greeted with applause.

T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, took part in the presentation of the awards.

New Parliamentary Group Leader Elected

LD2805183388 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Yuriy Khristoradnov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, one of the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has been elected chairman of the USSR Parliamentary Group at the general meeting of the Parliamentary Group. On the proposal of Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the meeting has decided to relieve Lev Tolkunov of the duties of chairman of the Parliamentary Group in connection with his retirement on pension for health reasons.

Italian Communist Daily on Plenum Results

PM2705105088 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 24 May 88 p 8

[Giulietto Chiesa dispatch: "Gorbachev's Theses Prevail"]

[Text] Moscow—The CPSU Central Committee Plenum has met and approved the "theses for the 20th party conference." The meeting was a quick one, even though there were speeches from 20 people—mostly first secretaries of the major republics and regions—as well as an introductory address and political conclusions, both from Gorbachev. The substance of the Soviet leader's two speeches and of the other contributions has not been reported but the very fact that the plenum was convened and had the outcome that it did seems to confirm that a solid compromise, a new balance, has been reached within the party leadership. Indeed until some 10 days ago authoritative spokesmen such as Fedor Burlatskiy were saying that a plenum meeting would "not necessarily" take place "before" the conference and that the theses might be simply "proposed by the Politburo." Instead they have been approved by the plenum. This may have entailed some concessions with regard to the more advanced points advocated by the renewalists, but on the other hand it furnishes the "theses" with a political authority that not even a majority of conservative delegates could undermine. In order to assess the compromise established, however, it is necessary to read the lengthy document which, according to the resolution approved by yesterday's plenum, is to be submitted to the party and the country for a "broad debate." However, it is already known (Gorbachev said so in his interview with THE WASHINGTON POST and NEWSWEEK) that it will contain many novelties.

Politburo: Unchanged Balance of Forces [subhead]

One of the proposals (and one that Khrushchev was unable to implement) is to limit the term of office of party leaders, including the general secretary. The resolution also contains a third point that has raised some questions among observers—the statement that the plenum "has instructed Party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev to deliver the report to the 19th conference." This point of emphasis cannot be a coincidence in the Kremlin's strict ritual of information and thus serves to indicate to the party and the country that the plenum's "confidence" in Gorbachev was reaffirmed at the end of a discussion that was doubtless not free from the asperities and open disagreements that continued from 13 March (the date of publication of Andreyeva's "anti-perestroyka platform") until a few days ago. The balance of forces within the Politburo has remained the same. The plenum examined only one "organizational issue" and promoted Writers Union First Secretary Vladimir Karpov from candidate membership to full membership of the Central Committee. It is likely therefore that the conference will take place with the Soviet leadership in its present form.

Increasingly Sharp Conflict [subhead]

However, further changes at the very next level down are not to be ruled out—on the contrary. No less than four first secretaries (including two republican first secretaries—Armenia's Demirchyan and Azerbaijan's Bagirov) were replaced last week in the midst of the conference delegates election campaign. At this level the conference campaign is now accelerating and witnessing a harsh struggle between the various supporters and adversaries of perestroyka. Yesterday Burlatskiy, a political scientist; Zaslavskaya, a sociologist; and Abalkin, an economist, gave an official press conference at which they openly condemned the party apparatus' attempts to impose candidate delegates by undemocratic means for the sake of their own interests and of seeking to remove the candidates issue from public discussion. Zaslavskaya—one of the foremost intellectuals of the renewal process and a pioneer, during the decline of the Brezhnev era, of uncompromising analyses of the status of Soviet society—declared outright that her candidacy was rejected by her local party committee. She added that she believed that the current conflict is between "democratic revolutionaries" (among whom she included Gorbachev and Yakovlev) and "revolutionary conservatives." These latter, in her opinion, "have no leader or have leaders who remain in the shadows."

Kharchev 'Remarkably Frank' on Religion

PM2705113488 Paris LE MONDE in French 27 May 88 p 4

[Unatrributed report: "Revealing Document on Mr Gorbachev's Religious Policy"]

[Text] Dissident Russian-language weekly LA PENSEE RUSSE, published in Paris, has just published a report on a lecture—cited at length by LA CROIX in its 26 May

edition—delivered at the CPSU's Higher Party School by Konstantin Kharchev, a member of the Soviet Government and chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs. Mr Karchev's statements, which were remarkably frank, reveal that the proposal to reform legislation on religion in the USSR has one essential aim: to enable the party to more effectively control the Soviets' growing enthusiasm for religion.

"At present," Mr Kharchev explained to the future party cadres, "religiosity is showing no tendency to wane. We in the party have been caught out by our own antireligious policy of restrictions and prohibitions. We have isolated the priests from the faithful, but this does not give the faithful more confidence in the authorities. We must educate a new type of priest. The selection and appointment of priests is the party's business."

Mr Kharchev then drew a distinction between the attitude of the Orthodox hierarchy, which is regarded as very docile in the USSR, and the other religions: "In controlling religion and stifling its initiatives, we have been most successful with the Orthodox Church. But the strengthening of other confessions worries us: the Catholics, who are still surviving, and the sects. In Lithuania, 20,000 children are being taught the catechism, in secret, of course. In central Asia, there are hundreds of clandestine Koranic schools. When I raised the problem of religious instruction in high places, I was rapped on the knuckles: 'Sunday schools after 70 years of Soviet regime would be the last straw!'

"Whether we like it or not," Mr Kharchev added, "religion is penetrating socialism and is even making great inroads into it. But, in view of the fact that we have all the power, we have the means of channeling its course, in keeping with our interests."

Finally, Mr Kharchev said that it is impossible to allow the churches to engage in charitable activities because it is "the Catholics, Protestants, and Baptists" who would derive propaganda benefit from it.

Nikolayev Blames Ministry for Siberian Air Crash

PM2605152188 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 May 88 Second Edition p 6

[Ya. Nikolayev article: "Those To Blame for the Air Crash: The Air Traffic Controller Was Powerless..."]

[Text] Buryat ASSR—Our newspaper has already reported on the air crash which happened in a mountainous region of the Buryat ASSR when an L-410 with 15 passengers and 2 crew aboard crashed into a mountainside near Bagdarin airfield. There were no survivors.

Bauntovskiy Rayon is a construction zone on the Baykal-Amur railroad. Most of the passengers were construction workers or specialists from the new "Muyskiy" sovkhoz, headed by their director. But whoever the victims were, lessons must be drawn from the tragedy, and the main questions must be answered: Who was to blame, and could it happen again?

A state commission has taken part in an investigation into the accident held at the Ulan Ude aircraft enterprise. What were its findings?

"The conclusion is clear," V. Gerasimov, deputy chief of a USSR State Commission for Flight Safety administration, who headed the commission, said. "The disaster was the fault of the crew: Captain O. Lyanishev and Copilot N. Konovalov. In very difficult weather conditions, with unusual winds for those parts and in snow, the crew took a rash decision which may now even be termed one of criminal recklessness. Unable to see the ground and in breach of the regulations governing flights in mountainous areas, they began to descend to carry out a visual search for a landing strip. It has now been established that the aircraft was 24 km off course and, furthermore, that the fliers were 50 km out when judging the distance to Bagdarin airport. So the aircraft was not where it ought to have been, with the result that it crashed into a mountainside...."

There you have it: crew error. But in the commission's opinion, it would be wrong and unfair to put it all down to them. After all, the whole activity of flying is so arranged that flight safety depends not only on the professional qualities of specific fliers. It also depends on the ground services, who are the crew's "insurance" and who direct the aircraft along its route. Are they doing their job properly and, if not, why not? Surely, here, too, we should seek to learn from the accident.

B. Zverev, chief of Bagdarin airport, showed me the primitive equipment in the flight control room.

"This is prehistoric equipment. On that tragic day, the aircraft was being directed by controller S. Kolomanov. Relying on the crew, as was done on numerous occasions, he was forced to permit the descent. What else could he do? The controller had no technical means of checking the fliers' calculations. Incidentally, the commission found no breaches of the regulations in his conduct. After all, the airport has its quota of equipment in full compliance wth the Ministry of Civil Aviation's directive...."

"I have experience of accident investigations," V. Gerasimov, deputy chief of the USSR State Commission for Flight Safety administration, continued. "In this case, we found the Ministry of Civil Aviation responsible for the air crash. Since 1975, there have been 15 similar cases in the East Siberian Civil Aviation Administration alone. In 13 of those cases, aircraft crashed into mountainsides. This lamentable statistic is evidence that the Ministry of Civil Aviation has no desire to tackle flight

safety problems on local air routes, particularly when dealing with airports in mountain regions. Yet 80 percent of the Buryat ASSR's airports are in the mountains."

F. Khodakovskiy, secretary of the Buryat CPSU Obkom, took part in the Ulan Ude airmen's meeting to discuss the lessons of the accident. The party obkom, together with the East Siberian Civil Aviation Administration, is preparing a package of measures to increase flight safety based on the results of that analysis.

"Incidentally, during the preparation of the well-known party and government resolution on the comprehensive development of production forces in the country's eastern regions, including the Buryat ASSR, we put a number of proposals to the Ministry of Civil Aviation but met with no understanding there," the obkom secretary explained. "As for modern navigation and communications facilities, only two airfields have radar sets. The rest are equipped in such a way that flight safety cannot be fully guaranteed."

So the passenger plane ran not just into a mountain but into a chronic and serious problem—the tendency to think only of the present day and to dismiss problems until they have become emergencies.

In Ulan Ude, measures are now being taken to prevent a recurrence of such a tragedy. But the efforts of the autonomous oblast's organs are clearly not enough. The state commission's conclusion can cause nothing but alarm. Therefore, a program for helping "small airfields" must be developed and urgently implemented. The price of delay is paid in human lives.

L'UNITA on Conference Delegates Dispute

PM2705094488 Milan L'UNITA in Italian
23 May 88 p8

[Giulietto Chiesa dispatch: "Moscow: Crucial Central Committee Session"]

[Text] Moscow—The fact that the "draft theses" were published as early as Thursday shows that a compromise has been reached within the leadership on the substance which, as Gorbachev has said, must characterize the transition to the "socialist constitutional state." The substance of this general formula is not yet known but the rumor is that the "theses" will embody guidelines for a radical swing toward democratization, redefining the very concept of the party's "leading role" and the separation of party and state responsibilities. They should establish a system of legal controls embodying a number of aspects, typical of the Western democracies, of mutual independence between the executive, legislative, and judiciary. Last, they should define the approach to a reform of the codes of civil and democratic freedoms (which the Supreme Soviet will launch in the coming years)—from a press law to a detailed definition of the limits of censorship and from matters relating to freedom of conscience and religion to citizens' right to travel abroad and return home. All that remains is to wait and see how many of these rumors are confirmed by the long (65-page) document to be submitted for discussion within the party and throughout the country. However, the plenum could also produce some spectacular surprises with regard to the composition of the party leadership. The fierce political struggle started by Andreyeva's 13 March SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA article seems to have ended with a modest victory for the renewalists, headed by the CPSU general secretary. If so, however, it should be made apparent by the new balance of forces within the Politburo. It seems increasingly clear that Yegor Ligachev is no longer the party's number two, though it is not yet clear who has taken his place or even whether anyone has yet taken over his responsibilities. Gorbachev made it clear at his recent meeting with media chiefs that he is now directly in charge of ideology.

Yakovlev and Razumovskiy are two names that are becoming increasingly prominent. The plenum could confirm this new situation through new appointments to the Politburo and Secretariat or through leaders' transfer from one position to another in the party hierarchy, if not indeed from party to state responsibilities. Here too it is simply a matter of waiting to see what happens. Another sign of the conclusion, albeit temporary, of the long trial of strength between adversaries and supporters of perestroyka came Saturday with the news the Armenian First Secretary Demirchan and Azerbaijani First Secretary Bagirov have been given early retirement. Both received heavy criticism during the serious Nagorno-Karabakh crisis. Demirchan was criticized harshly by PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA in December and January for hostility to renewal and advocacy of mafia-style party management methods. Bagirov, a favorite son of the already retired Geidar Aliyev, is accused of skillfully nurturing Azerbaijani nationalistic thrusts. Gorbachev allowed matters to calm down, then hit them both, the moment demonstrations resumed (there was one yesterday at Moscow's Armenian cemetery.) It is interesting to note that Moscow sent Yegor Ligachev and Georgiy Razumovskiy as its envoys to pension off Bagirov, while Aleksandr Yakovlev and Vladimir Dolgikh were sent to dismiss Demirchan. That is, four Politburo members, all of them also Secretariat members, showing that the two dismissals were not carried out painlessly.

Though new balances have become established in the leadership, the same cannot apparently be said with regard to the political struggle between the tendencies within the party organizations. Indeed the selection of delegates to the conference began amid strong disputes, and the renewalists have already dropped a number of prestigious candidates. Two Moscow party election district committees (news spreads faster in the capital) have turned down the candidacies of Vitaliy Korotich, editor of the weekly OGONEK, and Yuriy Afanasev, director of the historical records institute. In recent months both have distinguished themselves by adopting strong

stances in favor of renewal. A contrasting sign has emerged from the Moscow writers' union, which chose as its delegate to the conference Chernichenko, a writer well known for his progressive stances. There are several indications that regional party leaderships are stubbornly defending traditional methods of selecting delegates, imposing candidates from above and allowing their own men through. Even when a more democratic and "open" approach prevails within local leaderships, however, what happens—as SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA described yesterday, citing the situation in Novorossiysk, a small town on the Black Sea—is that the party grassroots organizations adhere to the same authoritarian methods and try to exclude members and citizens from discussions about candidates. In Novorossiysk a factory's candidate, already "nominated" by the party committee secretary, was dramatically rejected by a party aktiv meeting. The case is cited as an example, clearly to encourage members not to accept underhand maneuvers. This is a large country, however, and it is impossible to keep a watch on everything. Now that the debate is open (and it could even lead to a vote) everyone realizes that the political orientations of the 5,000 delegates could prove crucial to perestroyka's future.

Delegate Elections Still Face 'Inertia'
PM2605135688 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 May 88 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondents B. Prokhorov, V. Ovcharov, and L. Gladysheva reports under general heading: "According to the Law of Glasnost" and the rubric "Election of Delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference in Progress"]

[Text] Barnaul—The school of democracy is based on political dialogue. The election of delegates to the all-union party conference is not a bad dialogue in this sense. The collective of one of the sectors of the "Sibenergomash" Association in Biysk named its candidate. But a different candidate was proposed at a session of the association aktiv. He got through. However, both candidates were invited to the party gorkom plenum. After a comprehensive discussion the plenum gave preference to mechanic I.I. Maksimov. In Mikhaylovskiy Rayon a pensioner has been elected as a candidate. I was not particularly surprised. I know K.A. Aydarkhanov. Before he retired he was head of the Mikhaylovskiy party raykom and did a great deal for the socioeconomic renewal of the rayon....

Is it possible to say with any certainty that the election of candidates has gone totally smoothly? Hardly. Inertia and old attitudes still have a firm hold on some party workers. The Novoaltaysk Gorkom telephoned the kraykom: Who should we elect? Whomever people think best. But which organization should nominate the candidate for delegate? You know best. But could we perhaps this time not elect a railroad worker? The same old familiar questions. The stereotyped caution still lingers: What will the reaction be at the top? But the lower levels will make no mistake—they know who is in favor of restructuring. In Kytmanov I.V. Aparin, first secretary of the party raykom, was named candidate at the meetings without any doubt or hesitation. People associate his name with the good changes that have begun in the region. I interviewed Ivan Vasilyevich and another delegate, L.V. Markin. What ideas will they be taking with them to Moscow and what will they be fighting to achieve?

I.V. Aparin:

I agree with those who propose holding a discussion on the party and its role at the present stage. But I think of this discussion as a practical exercise as well as an exercise in theory. What kind of actions could enhance the party's prestige? It could do a number of things, as a large river has many tributaries and streams. Here is an example. It must sadly be admitted that at present our country has too many leading production workers who are not party members. Another point. We decide for the masses, and not always accurately. We have often acted as substitutes for economic workers and continue to do so. But it is not simply a question of the stereotyped ideas we still have in our heads. Changing our style is not the same as turning over a record. I have been in the party for 19 years and have had it up to here with our sluggishness. Because we are so tied up with economic concerns we do not have time for people's spiritual needs.

There has been so much talk and so many dreams of kolkhoz independence, but last year farms in our rayon were forced to sell 13,000 tonnes of grain from their own stocks in excess of the plan. How did this come about? Moscow issued a command and Barnaul backed it up: You must surrender your grain. We sent for farm leaders and said: You must surrender your grain. We were on bended knee. Then farms were forced to buy mixed feed for their livestock. They paid three times more than the cost price of the grain. So how can real economic accountability be introduced in practice?

The party's prestige is strengthened by the solution of these problems and our persistence. But I must point out that some Communists would like to stay put behind the party's broad back. It will not work. We say loudly and clearly that every Communist must play a leading role.

L.V. Markin, director of the "Transmash" Plant:

All our thoughts and concerns are for restructuring. One gratifying feature is that glasnost and democracy are making it possible to disclose flaws and shortcomings and have opened the way to developing more efficient forms of economic management. What is distressing, unfortunately, is that quite good decisions and proposals do not always carry real weight in practice. Old approaches to doing things and stereotyped ideas—the whole braking mechanism—are still making themselves felt. It is not proving so simple to knock them from their

perch. I went to talk to my own ministry—the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building—about the problems standing in the plant's way. I could feel that they did not really understand what I was talking about. Then I produced my biggest trump card, so to speak: the Law on the Enterprise.

I think the conference should give a principled assessment of the negative phenomena that have become apparent. Some enterprises have adopted an oversimplistic interpretation of independence—they regard it as an opportunity to relax their efforts and to have no obligations to their partners. Everywhere we are reiterating the indisputability of the law on contract deliveries but this law is falling into decay. Fines do nothing to improve the situation....

In short, I am full of ideas on ways to restructure. I hope that the conference will answer many questions, strictly assess certain phenomena, and make it clear exactly what stage we have reached in the restructuring process.

Cheboksary—Does a Communist have the right to his own opinion? Does a party organization have the right to its own opinion? This right is enshrined in the party Statutes—there would seem to be no problem. There are problems, however. The main problem is that after many years of "command centralism," when the discussion of any proposal from above in the lower echelons amounted to nothing more than "unanimous approval," we have forgotten how to exercise our statutory rights, including the right to have an opinion of our own.

These ideas colored a discussion with working people from the Cheboksary Unit Plant who came to the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondents' center a few days before the Chuvash party obkom plenum. They were exasperated by the party committee's formal approach to nominating a candidate for delegate to the 19th all-union party conference. The shop "quadrumvirates" and a handful of engineers and employees were hastily assembled in the training unit in the middle of the working day, a few banal speeches were made, followed by a quick vote, and then the meeting was wrapped up. This kind of truncated democracy is not to the workers' liking....

I would say that commitment is one of the most noteworthy features of the campaign to elect delegates to the 19th all-union party conference, I.P. Prokopyev, first secretary of the Chuvash CPSU Obkom, said during our conversation before the plenum. We have been keenly aware of this at meetings nominating candidates for delegate and from the letters and telephone calls the obkom has received. The unit plant also telephoned, incidentally. Old, stereotyped ideas have clearly been at work there, because they have had to correct comrades and hold extra meetings in the workshops. The second feature I would like to point out is that people who take an active social stance have been able to progress.

This, for example, is how the candidate was elected in the Cheboksary Instrumentmaking Plant collective. Having failed to reach a unanimous opinion after long debate, the party committee left the choice totally open to the Communists themselves. The debate continued for over 3 hours. Eventually the instrument-makers arrived at their final proposal: They recommended engineer-regulator L.A. Slonimskaya as candidate for conference delegate.

So why did they settle on the young engineer L.A. Slonimskaya? Many at the plant recognize her as an enterprising person with character and a mind of her own who never ingratiates herself with the bosses and always stands up for her own honest, principled opinion. She does not try to get out of working but, on the contrary, endeavors to take the most difficult tasks upon herself.

Taking as much as they can on themselves, fighting for new ideas, standing up for their own opinion—almost all the candidates nominated at the Chuvash Obkom plenum as prospective delegates to the all-union party conference can, with full justification, be said to have these important social qualities.

So the plenum began the election of delegates. The discussion lasted for more than an hour. The Chuvash party organization had never known anything like it. As well as making observations and giving advice for the benefit of the future delegates, the speakers also addressed proposals to the conference itself.

After the plenum I asked M.I. Fedotov, deputy chief of the obkom organizational department, whether he was satisfied with the way the elections had gone.

I now feel that a great deal could have been done differently. After all, essentially we are still only learning practical intraparty democracy. It is very hard to break the cliches and habits we have adopted.

An honest opinion.

Vladimir—A total of 35 delegates will represent the Vladimir Oblast Communist organization at the 19th all-union party conference. The party obkom bureau has recommended 35 of the 128 candidates nominated by party committees and bureaus, labor collective councils, and social organizations.

The ordinary person still finds it strange to have to think about this choice beforehand. It is also strange for the party committees to have to make independent decisions, because until recently they were given instructions from above as to whom to elect.

So many blunders occur because people would like to vote for one person but someone else is persistently recommended to them! But the main tragedy is the loss of individual opinion and the right to cast your vote for the person you trust.

Often the same people were "trusted" because little was known about others, who did not feature on the list.

Suddenly there is no restrictive bureaucratic system. There are people—real living people who are not indifferent, who are interested. They argue, discuss, stand up for themselves. When they cannot reach a unanimous opinion they nominate two, three, four candidates.

Last November the CPSU Central Committee discussed the question "On Glasnost in the Work of Party and Trade Union Organizations and Soviet Organs in Vladimir Oblast," so the nature of preparations for the all-union party conference in a way reflects the lessons learned from this resolution. It was as a result of the resolution that new forms of direct communication with people appeared in the oblast, which have helped to deepen democracy and develop glasnost—direct telephone link-ups, Friday talks at the Political Education Center, a public opinion institute at the newspaper PRIZYV. It would have been to the benefit of the cause to see them involved in the election of delegates!

This did not happen. A mere 5 days before the party obkom plenum PRIZYV published the lists of nominated candidates. But there was not enough time left to discuss them.

The election of the delegates was the first item on the agenda of the scheduled plenum (in some oblasts cases have been known of elections being started after 3-4 hours of intensive work on other issues, so that the voting was doomed to haste and indifference).

The candidate delegates invited to the plenum sat in the front rows of the auditorium. Their presence and their agitation also created a special atmosphere. That is probably why, when discussing the nominations, everyone wanted to say the most appropriate, distinctive, sincere things about them.

I talked to Natalya Ignatyeva, deputy director responsible for youth education at the Sverdlov factory: What does she find attractive in the character of Galina Yefremova, first secretary of the Kameshkovskiy party raykom? What are the special qualities that have gotten her elected as a delegate to the all-union party conference?

Perhaps I am not saying the most important thing, she replied, but whatever difficult problem we have—social, personal, or connected with work—we go to her for advice, for judgment, for confession. It is always hard to get hold of her in the "primary organizations" and the raykom. She never loses her temper or raises her voice—she always treats you like a person, even when she is strongly making a point of principle. I once heard some people talking about her in a store: Given half a chance, they said, she would be off to a new apartment. But she has always lived on the fourth floor of a prefabricated block with her family. She goes to her garden plot by bicycle, but even that is rare—when does she have the time? She spends too long working on subbotniks and at the cooperative youth center. V. Fedorov, director of the Kovrov V.A. Degtyarev Plant, recommended party committee secretary V. Martynov for election as conference delegate:

Valeriy Borisovich has risen from milling machine operator to party committee secretary. He is a real advocate of restructuring.

The plenum participants discussed with interest the candidates nominated at grass roots level. But then a name emerged from the so-called "central list"—V.G. Klyuyev, USSR minister of light industry. This seemed to be a suitable moment to ask the minister (a proposed delegate!) what he had done for restructuring? It was not, however. Following the well-worn rut, people only come to him with requests.... They do not ask questions, and there has certainly been no certification of the 6 (out of 13!) members of the obkom bureau whose names are being entered on the lists for secret ballot.... The custom of not discussing the people at the top is still very much alive....

Tarasenko Views People's Power, Restructuring

PM2705095188 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 21, May 88 (Signed to Press 19 May 88) pp 1, 2

[N. Tarasenko "Editor's Column": "Guarantee of Restructuring"]

[Text] What is democracy? We learn in our school days the meaning of the Greek words "Demos"—people, and "Kratos"—power. In other words, power of the people.

Quite! But only 3 years ago, we hardly paused to ponder the deeper meaning of this word. We simply asserted: We have democracy. By way of proof, we cited the constitutional provision: All power in the USSR belongs to the people. In real life, however, administrative edict methods of management "called the shots," and bureaucratism flourished on a lavish scale.

The excessive centralization of power in ministries and departments led to petty tutelage of enterprises and, consequently, to the inevitable proliferation of the management apparatus. There emerged an army of economic, cultural, and scientific functionaries whose main job consisted of paperwork and the creation of numerous codes of law, directives, and instructions.

As the years passed by, the functionaries developed an awareness of their own exclusiveness and a belief that they, and they alone, held everything together. They usurped the right not only to make decisions but also to think and speak on behalf of, and supposedly on instructions from, the people. An enterprise collective "receives from on high" a blatantly deflated or inflated target, the wages of skilled and sloppy workers are leveled, a useless leader is appointed—and all this is based on nothing but "state interests" and is, of course, solely "for the people's benefit."

Now we have realized the price of the deviations from democratic principles. The economy ended up in a pre-crisis situation. Formalism and stage management permeated the soviets' practical work. The principles of social justice were deformed. This was honestly and frankly said at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress. Then came January 1987. Broad democratization became the program task of the party and society.

Today we are learning to live and work under new conditions. This process is by no means a simple one. The restoration of the truth about our history, glasnost, and the legal consolidation of labor collectives' long-awaited rights have created new conditions for all ideological and sociopolitical life. But we are still in no hurry to exercise our freedom for the benefit of the people and the state. The fault lies not only with the bureaucrats who continue to exercise the right to command, to ban, and to dictate. The truth is that many have gotten used to living according to prescriptions, to waiting for further explanations and additional instructions.

But even so, democratization is gathering strength. Workers and employees are electing their enterprise directors. Communists are electing party raykom secretaries on the basis of competitiveness [konkursnost]. For the first time, there are more candidates than deputies' seats in local soviet elections. We are reverting to Lenin's cooperative plan. Finally, socialist pluralism is getting its "residence permit."

I leaf through newspapers and journals, read letters received by the editorial office. They contain quite a few categorical and diametrically opposite opinions. This is evidence that a real process of restructuring is under way. People are trying, through discussions and arguments, to interpret the changes that are taking place and to define their position in restructuring. By no means is everyone yet in a position to correctly assess the present situation.

There are also people who, under conditions of glasnost and openness, are trying to take us back to the state of stagnation and conservatism, of authoritarian-bureaucratic distortions. These people feel strong nostalgia for the past. An illustration is provided by the sensational article by N. Andreyeva. This is not a question of a specific author but a question of the very essence of the platform that was outlined and its incompatibility with the political context of the time. Wittingly or unwittingly, the article proved to be aimed against the basic stipulations of our restructuring and society's democratization. A PRAVDA editorial article dealt a fitting rebuff to the champions of the "restoration" of historical justice. The day before, I had been pleased to read a clipping from the newspaper TAMBOVSKAYA PRAVDA, sent to the editorial office by a reader. That newspaper published notes from sociopolitical readings which criticized the antirestructuring platform.

So, what is democracy, really?

This question is especially topical on the eve of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. The very fact that such a representative assembly of Communists is being convened at a crucial stage of restructuring is evidence of a Leninist approach toward solving pressing problems.

The conference will analyze the progress of restructuring, will give it a new and powerful boost, and will map out radical measures for the democratization of society. Our advance is possible only through the consistent development of democracy and socialist self-management. As M.S. Gorbachev remarked at the 7 May meeting in the CPSU Central Committee: "...The key to everything lies in democratization, in the involvement of the people in everything. This is why the goal of restructuring is man, and the means of restructuring is the mobilization of human potential. It is through this and, of course, through the spiritual sphere and the strengthening of the people's spirit, that we will advance restructuring."

...The processes of renewal are spreading to more and more strata of social life. The practice of the last 3 years proves that only genuine power of the people is the main guarantee of the irreversibility of the processes of restructuring.

'Original' Andreyeva Letter Analyzed

PM2605143288 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 23 May 88 p 8

[Giulietto Chiesa dispatch: "Secret Story Behind Anti-Gorbachev Manifesto"]

[Text] Moscow—"Reflections on the Future." This was the original title of the now famous and unintentionally "historic" letter that Nina Andreyeva sent to the editorial offices of a number of central newspapers (which rejected it) long ago in September 1987. The copy in our possession, totalling 18 pages, bears her signature: Andreyeva Nina Aleksandrova, CPSU member since 1966, candidate of technical sciences. Alongside this, an anonymous hand has written: 7/9/87—presumably the date of receipt. We do not know from which editorial office it reached us. What we do know is that it was shelved pending a better moment. We know—because Andreyeva herself said so at a public meeting at the KGB's higher school in Leningrad at the end of March—

that she decided to send it to the Party Central Committee, to Yegor Ligachev in person. We have already told leaders how that letter was exhumed, transformed, and rewritten by a group of editorial staff on the daily SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and presented to the public on 13 March this year. PRAVDA on 5 April devoted a full-page editorial article to it, describing the letter as an "anti-perestroyka platform." During these 3 weeks of silence, when dozens of party organizations met to applaud the "swing", when Ligachev himself, at a meeting of newspaper editors, described the article as an "example to be followed", and when photocopies of the article were distributed to several newspaper editors, a battle crucial to the future of Soviet society's democratization took place. This is a brief account of it. Now that we have the original version and can compare it with that published by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, we can form a better picture of "Operation Andreyeva." It must be said right away that the editorial staff of that Soviet newspaper retained only approximately five pages of the original letter. The rest disappeared entirely or was revamped, softened, and made more "acceptable."

Other parts were entirely new precisely so that Andreyeva's letter could become an outright political platform and serve as a spearhead aimed at well defined adversaries. For instance, and this is only one of many examples, Nina Andreyeva attacks Shatrov's two plays "The Brest Peace" and "Blue Horses on a Red Meadow" but could not at that time have known "Onward, Onward..." which was not published until 1988.

The editorial staff added an entire paragraph to complete the item. An analysis of the additions would turn the present article into a treatise, however. The important thing here is to point out what was removed. Is this evidence of the many manipulators' sense of responsibility? On the contrary. Those who had Andreyeva's letter in their possession were acquainted with its "entire" content, so they knew with whom they were dealing. The first question—and a serious one—is: Why did they choose Andreyeva's letter from the tens of thousands received daily by newspapers, the Supreme Soviet, and the CPSU Central Committee? They presented a discreetly "expurgated" Andreyeva, but only because they realized that the "real" Andreyeva was unacceptable. This is an excellent example of the image used by writer and critic Yuriy Karyakin in the latest issue of OGONEK: "Zhdanov lavender." This is a liquid that used to be sprinkled in rooms where people had died to conceal the stench of the corpse. It is nothing to do with Zhdanov, the Central Committee secretary and close aide of Stalin's. The parallel still applies, however. How to explain Nina Andreyeva's actual thoughts to the Soviets of glasnost and Gorbachev-style democratization?

Khrushchev Cut [subhead]

"I would very much like to know (this is in both versions) to whose benefit it is that after they have left their posts, all top CPSU leaders are discredited and spat on for their real and alleged errors committed while they were deciding on extremely complex problems along an unexplored historical path? What is the origin of such a passion for dismissing the authority and dignity of the leaders of the world's first socialist country?" Zhdanov lavender removes the rest, however. What Andreyeva added was this: "Have we really not had enough of the tragic and negative consequences for the entire international communist movement and the education of young people caused by the sudden news of Khrushchev's speech to the 20th CPSU Congress supplied to ordinary people in the West?"

There is talk of Stalin, of course, to whose defense most of both the original and the published versions are devoted. "I believe that the "attacks on Stalin" and on the "state ship" of socialism are a kind of "camouflage" whose main purpose is "to serve as a prelude to a direct attack on Lenin and Marxism-Leninism as a whole, to whose stances Stalin was entirely devoted." [quotation marks as received] There are other purposes, too, however: "Quite clearly they aim at the political and ideological rehabilitation of the 'left-wing' and right-wing opposition within the party." And, last, "at a radical revision of the overall party line for the country's industrialization, agricultural collectivization, and the cultural revolution that transformed our country into a major power. All this is arbitrarily included in the 'personality cult' formula, is challenged, and Stalin is portrayed in colors more typical of Goebbels' cliches." What about the present? "No epithets are spared to denigrate the socialism achieved in our country." "The entire 1968 'Prague spring' lexicon is used publicly! For that matter, in Czechoslovakia, too, it all started with the writers' congress and the Zionists! And how did matters end?" The indictment, wisely cut by the editorial staff, assumes an epic tone: "The court of the 'anti-Stalinists' find it convenient to conceal their inadmissible interests on the road to perestroyka behind this hullabaloo about Stalin."

To use an expression by Prokhanov, she finds a way of supporting the assertion of the idea of the strong and able man of destiny—"the ideal of the superman, whose realization has long been denied by the dictatorship of the proletariat. The writer is correct to regard this as a direct threat to our socialist ideal." All that is left is to accuse anti-Stalinists of espionage, and indeed the charge duly appears: "All this is unlikely to take place 'without (quoting Prokhanov again—L'UNITA editor's note) the involvement of the secret services, which create intellectual and cultural currents, surreptitiously introducing them into our conscience." So the supporters of perestroyka are in the same category as those in the West—"professional anticommunists of all kinds"—"wanting to extend the front of attacks on Stalin." Who are they? "The innumerable offspring of the classes overthrown by the proletarian revolution, who have by no means forgotten their ancestors' social losses...the supporters and spiritual heirs of Trotskiy, Kamenev, Preobrazhenskiy, Zinovyev, Bukharin, Yagoda, (the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA version mentions only Trotskiy and Yagoda—

L'UNITA editor's note) and other wholly real opponents such as the heirs of the NEP-men, Asian bandits, and wealthy peasants outraged by socialism, who have never accepted the situation, as well as those who were—rightly or wrongly—the target of the repressions of the bodies of workers and peasants power at a difficult stage in its establishment (this part was also removed—L'UNITA editor's note). This revives the idea of class inheritance. The sons of class enemies are class enemies."

Like their fathers, therefore, they deserve to be kept at bay or, at worst, repressed. Are we exaggerating? Not at all, because Andreyeva goes on: "Having inherited the 'lessons of their fathers', this new progeny, hardened in the struggle for survival, as social control and the control of political education grew weaker, has occupied prominent positions in economic activity, commerce, science, the arts, and the media, helping to 'demythologize' Stalin and the government of the dictatorship of tne proletariat."

Andreyeva, therefore, sees the emergence of a new class of restorers of capitalism in the near future. Soon we shall see to whom she is referring. I cannot omit to point out that, just for once, her "editors" were more explicit than she in describing and justifying the violence of the "proletarian state" against its own citizens. The following excerpt is not in the original version but was published by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. "As is well known, a great historical leader (guess who this means—L'UNITA editor's note) is shaped within specific social, economic, ideological, and political conditions. They have a crucial impact on the subjective and objective selection of contenders called on to resolve various social problems. To remain afloat, the contender, brought onto the stage of history, must take account of the conditions of the time and of the prevalent social and political structures and implement through his actions the dictates of objective laws, inevitably leaving the mark of his personality on historical events. For instance, in the final analysis, few people now have any doubts about Peter the Great's personal qualities, but everyone remembers that under his leadership the country rose to the level of a major European power. Time has highlighted the result, which now forms the basis for an assessment of Emperor Peter's historical figure. The innumerable flowers on his sarcophagus in the Peter and Paul fortress cathedral reflect the respect and gratitude of our contemporaries, remote from the autocracy."

Does this go beyond beyond the "real" Andreyeva? It would be better to say that it is parallel. The deliberations of these "Marxist-Leninists" gradually slide back to "before" the October Revolution, to the recovery of the Russian, greater Russian, Slavic past. Here SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA prudently stops. Andreyeva goes much further, however, armed with her "Zhdanov lavender" but more and more explicitly racist. "The greatest danger, I believe, is constituted by the scandalous nationalism of insignificant nations such as the Tatars of the Crimea and Zionist-type Jews, whose actions are deliberately aimed at destroying friendship between the Soviet peoples." "In any case," Andreyeva continues, "I consider the annulment of the 1944 defense council decision to deport the Tatars of the Crimea a mistake. It was not only a strategically courageous decision but a correct decision that in no way conflicted with internationalism." How can it be theoretically justified? She produces a bizarre and Jesuitical (no offense to the "society") trick that cites even Marx as a "Jew", himself turned into an anti-Semite. What subtlety.

Dangers of "Zionist Teeth" [subhead]

"As we know, Marx defined entire nations (not individual classes or strata but actual nations) as 'counterrevolutionary' at particular stages in their history, urging a determined struggle against them, though he maintained friendly relations with many of their progressive elements. On the basis of a class approach, he was not ashamed to describe a number of nations, including his own, in destructive terms." So this is the real target—the Jews. "If you consider carefully, there is no economic, social, moral, or esthetic issue on which we members of this nationality do not have a more or less obscure joint position whose origins are to be sought in Zionism." So are all Jews automatically Zionists? Andreyeva lacks the courage to say so openly. Again she resorts to "Zhdanov lavender," that is, she asserts it while denying it: "Of course, not every Jew is a Zionist. But if you look carefully, almost all of them have Zionist teeth. It is dangerous not to perceive this. The Jews in our country have become a separate nationality. They are the only ones to have in their arsenal such a weapon as the charge of anti-Semitism. This label works perfectly, often very savagely." Andreyeva considers even the parafascist organization "Pamyat" less dangerous than the "Zionists." At worst, the mild teacher from Leningrad writes, "if intelligent people were to accede to the 'Pamyat' leadership, the result would be a petit bourgeois party in opposition to the CPSU." But if it is true that "Pamyat" has "its own platform, own officials, own funds, and own messengers," this is no less true of the "Zionists." Let us remember history, Andreyeva exclaims.

Let us remember Engels, who warned against these "comrades of a new kind" who were to "lead German social democracy to disaster." "In Russia they constituted the ideological and psychological backbone of Menshevism, intending to lead Russian social democracy to the same fate." Returning to the Tatars of the Crimea, Andreyeva puts forward the monstrous ideological barbarity of the "collective" punishment of a people. "In fact nobody deprived those Tatars of the Crimea who combatted the fascists of their civil rights. But those who in those terrible years rose en masse in support of the enemy had to answer 'collectively' for their betrayal of the Soviet peoples' friendship. It had to be clearly explained to their offspring that a historical responsibility does not end with the change of a Central Committee

general secretary." SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA lacked the courage to publish this passage, as it did the following, which returns to the present struggle—against Gorbachev: "The slogan 'More democracy means more socialism' must not entail an encouragement of political indiscipline, of the orgy of so-called 'informal organizations' that demand a role of opposition to Lenin's party. This is an irresponsible cosmo-political daydream that has insinuated itself onto screens and stages and into the media, a rash of irrepressible impulsive behavior, an ideological and political pluralism in the style of the bourgeois democracies. The 'market' and 'stall' of our country's social ideas can only be socialist, Marxist-Leninist." We will finish here (though we could continue) with our quotes from the original text. Many Soviet readers will have understood the message, even from the page that SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA published on 13 March under the title: "I Cannot Waive Principles." Other things, such as those we have published, they were unable to see. But those who have chosen Andreyeva's letter as their banner knew them already.

They knew, therefore, the virulent and potentially explosive nature of the dubious but only apparently paradoxical mixture that manages to combine anti-Semitism and dogmatism, Marxism-Leninism and ideas rooted in the Russian nationalism of the time of Alexander III's counter-reform. It is no coincidence that the "anti-perestroyka platform" bears these marks. Only a superficial glance could lead to the conclusion that such ravings are now obsolete. Their "modernity" boasts the date 13 March 1988. The West must realize—at a time when people are still considering whether to help or hinder Gorbachev—that the alternative to perestroyka, if it exists, is that which we have described here. It is an alternative that should cause everyone concern.

Leningrad Barrage Imperils Ecology

PM2305124588 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 13 May 88 p 11

[Harald Hamrin dispatch: "Activists Attempt To Break 'Ecological Siege.' Flood Barrage Construction Threatens Leningrad"]

[Text] Leningrad—The Soviet Union's second city, with a population of 5 million, is the target of a "second siege." During World War II, Leningrad was besieged by German troops for 1,000 days. Now there is an "ecological siege" that is no less terrible.

Petr Kozhevnikov is a young (34-year-old) Leningrader who has decided to muster a resistance force to break the ecological siege. It is an enormous task. Against him he has the whole of the Leningrad establishment, politicians, "official" reseachers, and experts in the state service.

He listed the "encirclement's" most important points: Krasnyy Bor, Sosnovyy Bor, Kirishi, Kingisepp, Priozersk—nuclear power stations, chemical factories, pulp industries. On all sides Leningrad is threatened by pollution, effluents in the water, and emissions into the air.

"Everything that can be done to kill Leningrad is being done," he said. "It is like the mafia, a bunch of criminals. A few people are trying to decide our fate."

But worst of all is the flood barrage being built in the Gulf of Finland, west of the city.

"Nature cannot take violence," Kozhevnikov said. "But the barrage is the worst form of violence. Cutting off the Gulf of Finland like that is like putting a tourniquet on an arm. It stops the free flow of water between Ladoga, the Neva River, and the Baltic. Just imagine stopping the circulation in a part of the body. It will go black and die."

In April 1987, Kozhevnikov gathered his troops and formed "Delta"—a so-called informal group which has already organized seminars and conferences, engages in information campaign work, and tries to get its factual material and views into the newspapers and onto television.

"Those in power view us as madmen," he said.

But as early as May 1987, Delta succeeded in gathering opponents of the barrage for a conference entitled "Ladoga-Neva-Gulf of Finland." Later there followed a forum called "The City's Health in the People's Hands" and a further conference at the premises of the Leningrad Writers Union in December last year.

"What a scandal it turned into," Kozhevnikov recalled, smiling. "There were people on their feet shouting, 'Blow the barrage up!'"

For the barrage is already well under way. It is emerging from the waves 30 km west of Leningrad. From Lomonosov on the south shore of the Gulf of Finland over to Kronshtadt, and from there over to the other shore: 25 km long, 35 meters wide, rising 8 meters above the surface of the sea, at a cost of over 10 billion kronor. Inside the barrage, a 400-square-km artificial lake is being created, cut off from the waters of the Gulf of Finland and the Baltic.

The paradoxical thing about the barrage, you could say, is that it is intended to save the city—but in actual fact, if Kozhevnikov is to be believed, it will lead to its death.

How can this be?

Leningrad—or St Petersburg, as the city was once called—was founded by Peter the Great at the beginning of the eighteenth century as a "window on the west" for Russia. It was built in the low-lying marshes where the Neva River discharges the waters of Lake Ladoga into

the Gulf of Finland. So low-lying were the marshes that—tradition tells—everyone coming to Leningrad had to bring a stone with them in order to enter.

Peter the Great, like later rulers, had a large number of canals dug and thus drained the marshes. But the city could not protect itself against the continual floods. They are caused by the enormous forces of nature against which man has so far been powerless: When the winter cyclones form over the Baltic, they play a little trick with air pressure. The water level is raised in concentric circles, and the outermost of these breaks over the city's canals and streets.

Leningraders have been hit by over 300 such floods in the city's 285-year history. The worst of them, in 1824, killed 569 people and is described in Aleksandr Pushkin's famous poem, "The Bronze Horseman." The last major flood, in December 1986, cost the city several hundred million kronor in flooded cellars, burst sewers, and severed electricity cables.

Over the centuries, various ideas have been put forward to protect the city against the mass of water. The latest and grandest is now being realized: A gigantic barrage across the Gulf of Finland will simply block the path of the water.

The barrage's creators have thought of two problems: the flow of water from Lake Ladoga and the sea traffic in from and out to the Baltic. When it is finished, the barrage will have a number of gates—the two largest about 200 m wide—which will permit free passage for shipping and the free flow of water. Only during the short periods in the year when the water rises above a certain level will the gigantic steel gates be closed.

But Petr Kozhevnikov and his friends in Delta think that there is a third problem, which the barrage builders have clearly not thought of and which will now be acute. He drew a simplified map and explained:

"Between the mouth of the Neva and the Gulf of Finland proper lies the Neva Bay," he said. "It is a narrow inlet, around 15-20 km wide, and runs for 60-70 km from east to west before it turns into the freer waters of the Gulf of Finland."

The barrage is being built right across the Neva Bay, halfway between Leningrad and the Gulf of Finland, with the small island and historic naval base of Kronshtadt as a sort of "bridge-pier."

Over the centuries, the waters of the Neva have deposited all sorts of waste in the Neva Bay: initially, for a couple of centuries, the city's own waste, and in more recent decades, industrial effluents from factories on the shores of the Neva and Lake Ladoga.

The waste has been deposited on the bottom, and the waters of the Neva Bay would have died long ago if it had not been for the floods. Nature has arranged things so wisely that the large bodies of water involved in the floods disturb the mud on the bottom of the bay and then take it out into the Gulf of Finland and the Baltic when water levels fall again.

"Quite simply the seawater cleaned the whole of the Neva Bay and brought in new oxygen," Kozhevnikov said. "Now the water is already immobile [staar redan stilla], despite the fact that the barrage is incomplete. The bay is being turned into a swamp full of microbes."

In the summer of 1987, a ban was placed on bathing in the whole of the Neva Bay inside the barrage. Even in the summer of 1986, bathers were affected by eye irritation and rashes. The sandy shores of the Karelian Isthmus are already being destroyed.

"It isn't a future catastrophe," Kozhevnikov said. "It is upon us right now. The Neva Bay is like the city's lungs, which are beginning to stop working."

Kozhevnikov and the Delta group also think that the whole problem of the floods has been exaggerated. The city's network of streets is nowadays 1.5 m higher than it was when the city was founded. Anyway, the barrage is too big: It will withstand high water levels which occur only once every 10,000 years.

"It is like building a dome over the whole of Leningrad to protect us against a new Tungus meteorite," he said, alluding to the famous 1908 meteorite which hit central Asia.

Other less expensive protective measures should have been taken. The city's canals should have been cleaned, its sewer system modernized, and electricity cables waterproofed. These are steps which will have to be taken sooner or later anyway.

Meanwhile, out in the Neva Bay, the barrage is rising out of the water slowly but surely. Large sections of the project, which was started in 1980, are already complete. According to the plans, the barrage will be completed in 1993, with a six-lane highway on top as part of a planned beltway round Leningrad.

Billions have already been invested. Few think that the advice from the Delta conference at the Leningrad Writers Union will be followed: "Blow the barrage up!"

Scientific

Two Artificial Earth Satellites Sent Into Space

'Cosmos-1949' Launched 28 May

LD3005073188 Moscow TASS in English 0717 GMT 30 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—The Soviet Union launched another satellite in the Cosmos series Saturday, May 28, to continue space exploration.

Cosmos-1949 was inserted into an orbiting path with the following parameters:

Initial period of revolution, 93 minutes;

Maximum distance from Earth, 431 kilometers;

Minimum distance, 412 kilometers;

Inclination, 65 degrees.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally.

'Cosmos-1950' 'Working Properly'

LD3105061488 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0554 GMT 31 May 88

[Text] Moscow, May 31 (TASS)—Another artificial earth satellite, "Cosmos-1950" was launched in the Soviet Union 30 May.

Scientific apparatus intended to continue research into cosmic space is installed on the satellite.

The satellite has been put on an orbit with the following parameters:

Initial period of orbit: 116 minutes.

Maximum distance from surface of the Earth (apogee): 1534 km.

Minimum distance from surface of the Earth (perigee): 1503 km.

Inclination of orbit: 73.6 degrees.

Apart from scientific equipment on board the satellite, there is also a radio system for precise measurement of elements of the orbit and a radio telemetric system for transmitting to Earth data on the work of the instruments and the scientific apparatus. The apparatus installed on the satellite is working properly. The coordinating-computer center is processing the information that is coming in.

Sagdeyev on Soviet-U.S. Space Cooperation

LD2805104688 Moscow TASS in English 1021 GMT 28 May 88

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Roald Sagdeyev, chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for Peace, Against Nuclear War came out today for the development of international cooperation in peaceful space exploration. He spoke at the press centre of the Soviet-American summit meeting. The Soviet expert mentioned the Phobos international project in which 12 countries are taking part as an example to be followed.

Sagdeyev pointed out that a proposal on organizing a joint flight to Mars of a Soviet-American expedition was not aimed at worming out secrets of the Strategic Defense Initiative. "So far as we can remember, the U.S. President officially stated that the U.S. could share SDI secrets with the USSR. However, they are not of much interest to us, because in this sphere we are following the course of our own. By the way, we could share the results of our research into this problem with the American side," the academician pointed out.

Touching upon the problem of concluding a treaty on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive armaments, the Soviet expert said: "The treaty on strategic offensive armaments will not be signed at the Moscow meeting. The volume of work for preparing the treaty turned out to be enormous, and not because someone did not want the treaty to be signed or hampered the working out of the treaty. Both sides realized that several months more were needed for working out a document that would be a basis of well-balanced and serious steps to be taken in the years to come."

Roald Sagdeyev recalled that, according to the INF Treaty, several hundred experts from the two countries would monitor its fulfilment on territories of the United States and the Soviet Union. He said that with the help of the INF Treaty we were learning to exercise control before the treaty on strategic offensive armaments was signed, because it would undoubtedly require more serious and strict measures in this sphere.